226P
L964

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK II, N. Y.

Society for Promoting Religion
and Learning

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_C0-ASP-771

THE SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FOUR GOSPELS

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR

The History of Marriage, Jewish and Christian, in Relation to Divorce and certain Forbidden Degrees. *Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

After Death. An Examination of the Testimony of Primitive Times respecting the State of the Faithful Dead, and their Relationship to the Living. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

The Intermediate State between Death and Judgment. Being a Sequel to *After Death. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Footprints of the Son of Man, as traced by S. Mark. Being Eighty Portions for Private Study, Family Reading, and Instruction in Church. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Footprints of the Apostles as traced by S. Luke in the Acts. Being Sixty Portions for Private Study and Instruction in Church. *2 Vols. Crown 8vo. 12s.*

The Divine Liturgy. Being the Order for Holy Communion, Historically, Doctrinally, and Devotionally set forth, in Fifty Portions. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

Studies in the History of the Book of Common Prayer. The Anglican Reform—The Puritan Innovations—The Elizabethan Reaction—The Caroline Settlement. With Appendices. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

The Bishops in the Tower. A Record of Stirring Events affecting the Church and Nonconformists from the Restoration to the Revolution. *Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

THE SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS

OF

The Four Gospels

BY

HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D.

DEAN OF LICHFIELD

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY NEW YORK

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1900

All rights reserved

26.P
964

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

✠

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE GUILD

OF

S. MARY AND S. CHAD

IN GRATEFUL ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF

MANY BLESSINGS SHARED WITH THEM

IN

SERVICES OF INTERCESSION

AND

DAILY EUCHARISTS

IN LICHFIELD CATHEDRAL

THIS BOOK IS DEDICATED BY

THEIR WARDEN

H. M. L.

✠

2 May 1900
$1.17

Preface.

Since I came to Lichfield I have generally delivered each year courses of Lectures to the Clergy in different parts of the Diocese upon Theological subjects. Those in which I endeavoured to set forth different aspects of the Four Gospels seemed especially to enlist the attention of my hearers, and I have been asked by not a few of them to put what I said into a permanent form. With a view to making this as useful as I could, I have largely developed the substance of the Lectures, and now send forth the result of my studies and meditations for a wider circulation. I do it in the hope and anticipation that the readers' interest will be so quickened by what to some, at least, may be new thoughts, that they will be induced to do for themselves on a more extended scale what I have here suggested. The late Professor Blunt of Cambridge, who inspired so much enthusiasm in his pupils, laid the greatest stress upon

the study of the Scriptures themselves; and he never tired of pointing out how much might be learned by reading and re-reading particular Books, Gospels, or Epistles, with the definite purpose of extracting all that bore upon some one special doctrine or subject.

If what I have done on these lines tends to encourage others to adopt the principle, I shall indeed have cause for satisfaction. It will help to save men from what I think is a dangerous snare and temptation in an age when books of devotion and meditation multiply with amazing rapidity. To read the most beautiful thoughts of others and to be satisfied with them, because they seem to be so much more helpful and instructive than anything which we are likely to produce by our own unaided efforts, will never make us to understand the Scriptures in the same way as he does whose "delight is in the Law of the Lord" itself: and in whose Law he meditates day and night.

On the main question of the special features of our Lord's Person presented by the several Evangelists, I have, in respect to the first and second

Gospels, parted company from the majority of interpreters; if I have erred, I find consolation in the knowledge that I err with S. Augustine; but I am not without hope that some, who have doubtless been chiefly influenced by the teaching of Christian Art alone, may be led to reconsider the views which they have taken. But whilst doubting the correctness of Christian Art in this, and other particulars which I could easily name, I am alive to its value. Two instances will suffice to show what a potent influence it has exercised, and to present at the same time a salutary warning, that its lessons may not be accepted on all occasions or without reserve. Artists, it must be remembered, are not necessarily profound thinkers, or the best interpreters of Holy Writ; and not infrequently a trifling circumstance has led them astray, and they have not had the critical tact of the student to detect the mistake. What can be more inappropriate than to assign the emblem of the Man to S. Matthew, and the Lion to S. Mark? Yet painters in every age and country have done it, with the rarest exceptions.

Again Gregory the Great asserted without the slightest authority that "the seven devils" cast out of Mary Magdalene were "the seven deadly sins," and from him the identification of her with the "woman that was a sinner" found its way into the Service-books of the Church, and was stereotyped by Art, so that, I believe, a grievous wrong has been done through its representations to one of the most beautiful characters in Sacred History. If I call the readers' attention to what I have written in Chapter XVI. it is to emphasise the protest I have made for many years, whenever the Magdalene has been identified with the penitent sinner.

In connection with Christian Art, I am tempted to allude also to another source of instruction, like it in beauty and interest, and little inferior in value, if it be used with care and discrimination: I mean, Legendary Lore. How often do we hear it spoken of as "utterly untrustworthy," or "unknown till the tenth century," or "quite unsupported by history!" I confess personally to having learned much from mediæval legends; often they have

seemed at first sight full of improbabilities; but it is very rarely that they have not repaid investigation, for there is often a great truth or principle lying at the bottom, which is worth bringing to light, while it is easy enough to see that the language in which it is clothed is only the poetic or romantic dress, unfamiliar to the matter-of-fact age in which we live. I can give no better illustration than by referring to the legendary belief that S. Luke added to the medical profession the art of painting, and gained no little renown by the seven portraits which he painted of the Blessed Virgin, and that he was able to use them on his missions with miraculous effect. How it was intended to be interpreted the reader may learn in Chapter xv.

There is only one other point to which I would call attention; it is the paramount importance of dogmatic teaching, as we find it illustrated on every page of S. John's Gospel. If I had not been precluded by the limits of space, imposed upon myself for a set purpose, I could have developed very largely its doctrinal and especially

its Sacramental characteristics. Many things have happened in the last year or two to show how singularly deficient the majority of lay-Churchmen are in their knowledge of doctrine. This is due in no small degree to the failure of their teachers to grasp the great truths of which S. John is the chief exponent. If we were to test the relative popularity among preachers of a Synoptic Gospel and that of S. John, we should find that far more sermons have been preached, especially in modern times, from the former than from the latter; and the excuse so frequently made is, that the people don't like doctrine. There may be some truth in the objection, if doctrine be preached solely for doctrine's sake; but if it be made the real basis of practical living, there is little or none. The experience of many in their pastoral visitations must tend to confirm what I say. Ask them what part of Holy Scripture the sick and dying prefer to have read to them, apart from the Psalms, perhaps, which have the foremost place because they are the best known, and they will tell you that it is not the simple teaching of

S. Matthew or S. Mark, but very often the sublime, mysterious, dogmatic chapters of the Fourth Gospel.

It is by no means an easy thing to acknowledge one's obligations to different writers on the Gospels. For many years I gave lectures at Cambridge and at Ely without any idea of gathering the substance of them into a book, and, in a long course of study of Biblical literature, I have doubtless often appropriated the thoughts and interpretations of others, and I know not now to whom I am indebted. Wherever I have been able to do so, at least in matters of importance, I trust that I have given my authority in the notes. My thanks are due to Bishop Anson and Canon Bodington, my much-valued colleagues on the Cathedral Chapter, with whom I have discussed some of the most difficult questions dealt with in these pages; while Canon Evans, my old fellow-Chaplain at Ely, has once more laid me under a great obligation by his kindness in correcting my mistakes and revising the proof-sheets. For the fourth or fifth time my eldest daughter, Mrs. Arbuthnot,

has made the index; and I doubt not that what to me would have been a tedious and uninteresting task, has through filial affection been changed into a real pleasure.

It only remains for me to express my regret that I have not been able to make this book less unworthy of the great subjects with which it deals; if only its merits could have been equal to the interest and joy with which I have written it, how different it would have been! I trust, however, that the Holy Spirit Who inspired the Gospels will give to my readers "a right judgment in all things," that they may accept nothing but what is in accordance with the Divine Mind.

H. M. L.

Deanery, Lichfield,
S. Stephen's Day, 1899.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

		PAGE
I.	Sources from which the Evangelists derived their Information,	1
II.	The Supernatural Guidance of the Holy Spirit,	10
III.	The Individuality of the Evangelist,	18
IV.	The Authorship of the First Gospel,	31
V.	Jewish Features in the Gospel,	40
VI.	The Jewish Estimate of Dreams,	47
VII.	The Fulfilment of Messianic Prophecy,	51
VIII.	The Kingdom of Christ's Church,	62
IX.	The Author of the Second Gospel,	75
X.	The Graphic Style of the Author,	86
XI.	S. Peter's Influence upon the Author,	94
XII.	The Humanity of Jesus Christ,	105
XIII.	Authorship of the Gospel according to S. Luke,	117
XIV.	The Medical Phraseology of the Gospel,	125
XV.	The Exaltation of Womanhood,	134
XVI.	The Woman that was a Sinner,	144
XVII.	Revelations of the Unseen World,	156

PAGE

XVIII. The Priesthood of Christ, . . . 166

XIX. Christ's Intercessory Office, . . . 171

XX. The Priest in Absolution and Pardon, 175

XXI. Priestly Attributes of Sympathy, Compassion, and Mercy, ... 179

XXII. The Sacrificial Character of the Eucharist, 182

XXIII. The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, 191

XXIV. Traditional Testimony to the Character of the Author, ... 201

XXV. S. John preserves the History of our Lord's Ministry at Jerusalem, . 210

XXVI. S. John's View of the Gospel History, and of Christ's Teaching, . . . 220

XXVII. The Sacramental Teaching of S. John's Gospel, ... 228

XXVIII. The Discourse on Eucharistic Doctrine in the Synagogue at Capernaum, . 239

XXIX. S. John's Witness to the Grace of Absolution, ... 249

XXX. Christ's Self-Revelation the surest Evidence of His Godhead, . . . 258

INTRODUCTION.

I.

Sources from which the Evangelists derived their Information.

In order that we may appreciate the special features to be found in the writings of the several Evangelists, it will be necessary to explain, as far as possible, two preliminary matters: the nature of the source from which they drew their materials for writing the Gospels; and the extent to which they were aided in the work by the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

As to the first, the most probable solution is that the source was twofold: oral tradition, and written documents. It is only in the combination of these that we shall be able to account for certain phenomena, which are somewhat perplexing.[1]

The sources of information were twofold.

[1] Especially the coincidences and differences, the substantial accuracy of the records of our Lord's discourses, and the great variety of detail in describing events.

Oral tradition, however, it has been argued, is "the parent of fable, and to admit a traditional source for the Gospels is to sacrifice their historic value." To the English mind tradition may, and does as a rule, convey the idea of much that is vague and untrustworthy. With us an historian must be able to give his authority and references for whatever he writes; nothing but written or printed documents will satisfy his readers, if the subject is important. The *Annual Register* or *Parliamentary Reports* must be appealed to before his testimony of what took place in the country at a particular date, or what subjects were debated in the political world, will be accepted and trusted. An eminent writer on the Gospels has spoken of the extreme difficulty that we should experience in attempting to write the biography of any great man, if we depended only upon the traditions of what he had said or done. "It is surprising," he says, "how little of spoken words ordinary memories are able to retain. I believe that any one who has been much in the company of a distinguished man will, on his death, be astonished to find how extremely little in the way of reminiscences of his conversations he will be able to recall."

The value of oral tradition.

Dr. Salmon's Historical Introduction.

He goes on to mention two historical exceptions,

viz., Dr. Johnson's Table-Talk by Boswell, and Luther's Tischreden or Mensalia by Lauterbach; but the former biographer never made any concealment of the fact that he depended for his knowledge of what his master had said, not only on his own personal recollection, but on the abundance of manuscript notes which he was in the habit of taking down, unseen by his friend, whenever the conversation turned upon any subject of interest. We have not, it is true, such definite information about the origin of the German Collection of Table-Talk, but it is commonly reported to have been somewhat similar. Neither in England nor Germany has there ever been much value set upon pure tradition; but before we think of disparaging its influence in the formation of the Gospels, it behoves us to realise what a totally different estimate was taken of it by the Jews. They regarded it as of the very highest authority, believing, as they did, that the principle of it had been stamped with the Divine seal on Sinai. God, they said, gave the bare Law in writing to Moses in the Mount, engraven on two Tables of Stone; but at the same time, during the forty days in which he remained with Him, God taught him the interpretation of its commandments at His own mouth. This was not

The Jewish estimate of the value of tradition.

written down; but the great Lawgiver was endowed with supernatural powers of memory, by which he retained this second teaching or Mishnah.[1] and was able to hand it on to others. Hence arose that "Oral tradition," which became the lifelong study of Jew after Jew for many centuries; and was so prized by them that they gathered up their estimate of it into a familiar aphorism: "The Mosaic Law is as water, the Mishnah as wine, and the Gemara[2] as hippocras."

Aids to memory.

In order to ensure the accuracy of tradition, the cultivation of the memory became a most important element in Jewish education. Almost from his earliest years a child was taught to learn by heart not only passages of Scripture but portions of the Mishnah, and to ensure exactness artificial aids to memory were commonly adopted.[3] The acrostic

[1] Mishnah is said to have seven significations among the Jews, but the primary one is "repetition," *i.e.* tradition. It is equivalent to the δευτέρωσις of Epiphanius. Cf. Schiller-Szinessy in *Encyclopædia Britannica.*

[2] Gemara is a commentary on the Mishnah, derived from a word signifying "deep study"; it is so highly valued, as containing the deliberate results of the doctors' discussions on the Oral Law.

Hippocras was a richly spiced drink, regarded by the Jews as a special luxury.

[3] The late Talmudic Reader at Cambridge wrote, "As for the difficulty of keeping in memory such a stupendous and vast work as the Mishnah, it is sometimes forgotten in this controversy that memory was aided by a great variety of mnemotechnic means

arrangement of certain Psalms and other parts of the Bible, especially those of a didactic character,[1] owe their origin to this necessity. It is not by any means an easy thing to learn the 119th Psalm with its 176 verses wholly unconnected, as they are, with each other by any historical or doctrinal sequence, but the task was rendered comparatively easy for a Jew by the alphabetical order in the Hebrew of the initial word of each of its twenty-two strophes.

The best proof, however, of the Jews' reliance upon oral tradition is to be found in a favourite injunction, "Commit nothing to writing," from which they only departed under special circumstances. This all shows the mistake of undervaluing oral tradition as a trustworthy source of information for writing the Gospels.

Now we can easily imagine that the Apostles, who accompanied our Lord as He went about teaching and preaching everywhere, would have

such as numbers and names of teachers, and by the existence of other works of the "Oral Law," which although they also were not written down, could be easily kept in memory because they rested on letters, words, and verses of the written Pentateuch." *Encyc. Brit.*

[1] Pss. ix., xxv., xxxiv., xxxix., cxi., cxii., cxlv.; Proverbs xxxi. 10-31; Lament. ii., iii. In Ps. cxix. it would not be difficult to recall eight verses all beginning with the same letter, and then proceed in the same way to another eight all beginning with another letter, and so to continue to the end.

little inclination or leisure for writing beyond, perhaps, occasional notes of His discourses. When, then, they received the command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," they had to determine first what was intended by "the Gospel," and secondly to secure its being faithfully represented in their preaching. The glad tidings of Jesus Christ were to be gathered out of the history of His Life, His works and words, of which they had been eye and ear witnesses; "we cannot but speak," said the leading Apostles, "the things which we have seen and heard." Perhaps they formed the nucleus or the substratum of their future teaching during their stay at Jerusalem, revising memories and comparing notes, shaping, in short, out of their individual and collective experience, the substance of the Gospel they had to deliver. Upon this they must have agreed before they devoted themselves to "the ministry of the word"; but when they began to exercise it, they held themselves free to dwell especially upon those parts which they severally selected as most suitable for the particular people to whom they ministered. Thus during the twenty years or more which elapsed between the Resurrection and the composition of the first of the Four

S. Mark xvi. 15.

The oral Gospel.

Acts iv. 20.

Gospels, there must have grown up a vast mass of Apostolic teaching, which has been called "the Oral Gospel" or "Evangelistic tradition," and this was the main source from which the Evangelists drew their materials. "It seems," says the Archbishop of Armagh, "to be as certain as anything of the kind can be, that an unwritten traditional Life of Jesus, graven upon the living heart of the Church, preceded the written Life."

Written documents.

Although, then, the Evangelists relied mainly on oral tradition, it is impossible not to feel that there were also written documents, probably in the vernacular of the country,[1] within their reach for consultation and use. The earliest and simplest would take the form of notes of our Lord's discourses and doctrine, perhaps made at the time by those who heard them, and subsequently enlarged. More extensive than these would be the narrative of the Apostles' preaching[2] and catechetical instructions[3] carefully drawn up, such as

[1] It was probably from these that the Aramaic words and phrases were taken, which we find especially in S. Mark's Gospel, Talitha Kumi, Ephphatha, Abba, Korban, etc.

[2] Those parts of the sermon recorded by S. Matthew v.-vii., and S. Luke vi., which are common to both, and resemble each other so closely must have been so preserved.

[3] S. Luke says that Theophilus had been so taught: *περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης*, i. 4.

S. Luke speaks of in the Preface to his Gospel. "Many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us"; or, as it is in the Revised Version, "to draw up a narrative concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us." These matters included the Birth, Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord, and some portions of His Ministerial work, especially His preaching, such for example as the Sermon on the Mount. Perhaps reports were made by followers of different Apostles, embodying different aspects of the manifold life of our Lord, as it presented itself to the individual preacher. When, then, S. Matthew, S. Mark, and S. Luke began the composition of their Gospels, they had not only the current tradition to fall back upon, but also written histories, both fragmentary and continuous. We are not told the exact process by which their labours gained universal recognition, but probably they were stamped in some way with the seal of the Apostolic Body. These three were the earlier Gospels, and as such were naturally simple in their teaching; but as time advanced, the Fourth Gospel embraced a wider area, and entered into deep doctrinal truths. Thus, when all had been written

The origin of the Synoptic Gospels.

S. John's Gospel.

that the Holy Ghost deemed necessary for the Church, the other and less important histories, which had been used in the composition of the larger ones, passed out of sight. If we may use a scientific expression, "the fittest survived," and the Four Gospels monopolised the field of sacred History and were held to contain "the whole truth."

II.

The Supernatural Guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Divine provision for writing the Gospels.

When our Blessed Lord was upon earth He must have contemplated not only the preaching of "the Gospel"—of what He had said and done in His earthly ministry—by His Apostles, but its preservation in writing for the instruction and guidance of the Church in all time to come. To enable them to do this with truth and accuracy He gave them repeated promises of supernatural assistance; twice he assured them of it in their temporary mission, whilst He was Himself preaching, once when He said, "Ye shall be brought before governors and kings for My sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles. But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall say, for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father Which speaketh

S. Matt. x. 18-20.

in you"; and again on another occasion, when He was bidding His disciples not to be afraid of confessing Him before men, "For the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say." S. Luke xii. 12.

Once also, when He was predicting the end, He repeated the same promise for their preaching after His departure: "The Gospel must first be published among all nations; but when they shall lead you and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate; but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye; for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost." These were all promises to enable them to meet and overcome persecution and gainsaying in their witness to Christ and His Gospel. There are two others of a different kind, not limited to any crisis of peril, but for their general preaching, and especially for writing their records of His Life:[1] "The Comforter . . . shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remem- S. Mark xiii. 10, 11. Promises of supernatural help. S. John xiv. 26.

[1] This would apply certainly to the first and fourth Gospels, which were written by Apostles. How far it applied also to the second and third will be seen when we come to consider these hereafter. The Early Church certainly thought they were brought within the scope of the promise by the aid which the writers received from S. Peter and S. Paul.

brance, whatsoever I have said unto you": and again, "When He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will guide you into all truth."

S. John xvi. 13.

It is no matter of surprise that such promises should have profoundly impressed the early Christians. Some of them interpreted the influence and action of the Holy Spirit in the composition of the Gospels as so overpowering that the Evangelists became little more than passive instruments in His hands, like a flute breathed into by its player, or a lyre struck by a plectrum, or a pen guided by the writer's will.[1] Some again held the infallibility of every word, that what was written was absolutely true in all its statements of whatever kind; "every jot or tittle was full of divine instruction": the writers were "filled with perfect knowledge in all matters."[2] Side by side, however, with these views, more reasonable estimates were formed, and by a greater number, so that Inspiration was considered for the most part as "an operation of the Holy Spirit acting *through* men, according to the laws of their constitution, which is not neutralised by His influence."

Exaggerated views of the promises.

Epiphan. Hæres. xlviii. 4. Origen, Com. in Matt. xvi. 12. Iren. adv. Hær. iii. 1. 1.

Bishop Westcott's Study of the Gospels.

At the Reformation, when some authority was

[1] This is "mechanical" Inspiration.
[2] This is "plenary," or "verbal."

sought for, to take the place of the Church, which, from the apparent indefiniteness of its traditions, the Reformers had come to discredit, it was found in a revival of an exaggerated belief in Inspiration, and the reinvestment of the Written Word "with all the attributes of a mechanical infallibility."[1] The Evangelists were again spoken of as passive instruments, the pens, the hands, the amanuenses, the scribes, the notaries of the Holy Ghost. All information came from Him, and even the words in which it was expressed and clothed were His. In these later days we have got back again to the best teaching of the Primitive Church, and nearly all who have studied the subject are agreed that the Holy Spirit's influence co-operated with, but never overpowered or hindered, the writer's natural faculties; and supernatural assistance was only given to guide men in the way of salvation. In the things of this life, they were left to exercise their own faculties of knowledge and reason and research; but in all that concerned the spiritual world, the Being of God, the nature of sin, the reward of holiness, the attainment of eternal life, and for the

Revival of an erroneous estimate of Inspiration.

Calvin, Gerhard, Calovius.

Modern belief on the subject.

[1] This is "dynamical," according to the technical language of the discussion. It is worthy of notice that the Church has not spoken authoritatively upon Inspiration, so that considerable latitude may fairly be allowed.

enforcement of doctrinal truths based upon them, they were guided, controlled, and aided by the Spirit of God.[1] This distinction rests upon a principle which God, Who does everything "after the counsel of His own will," invariably acts upon; viz., never to reveal supernaturally what man can discover for himself by any natural process. We shall do well to realise this, because it goes far to remove the popular difficulties created by discrepancies between Science and Revelation. Indeed it enables us to see that to have inspired the Sacred Writers in matters of Science, for instance, would have defeated one of God's great purposes for man's happiness and employment. Had He inspired Moses to describe the Creation according to the laws of Science, He must have inspired the people for whom he wrote to understand it—in other words, have anticipated the labours of Newton or Cuvier in those very great discoveries which the human intellect finds its highest delight in making for itself. This has been tersely expressed in these words, quoted with much significance by a writer of considerable note:

The Bible not intended to speak on scientific questions.

[1] Cf. Erasmus' *Epist.* lib. ii. tom. iv. ed. Basil. Non est necesse ut quicquid fuit in Apostolis protinus ad miraculum vocemus. Passus est errare suos Christus, etiam post acceptum Paracletum, sed non usque ad fidei periculum.

"Matters, which are discoverable by the means of investigation which God has put within the reach of man's faculties, are not the proper subjects of Divine revelation; and matters, which do not concern morals, or bear on man's spiritual relations towards God, are not within the province of revealed religion."[1]

This refers mainly to the Old Testament, but it has its application in a lesser degree to the writings of the Evangelists; for there are matters with which they deal incidentally, where we have no right to claim unerring accuracy. We have an illustration of this in S. Matthew's Gospel. He believed that the action of the chief priests in regard to the blood-money which they paid to Judas, and which was brought back by him and flung down before them in the Temple, was a fulfilment of ancient prophecy, and he recorded his conviction: "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him

xxvii. 9.

Mistakes in pure history quite possible.

[1] This is quoted from Quarry on Genesis xii. 13 by Professor Drummond in a remarkable Essay on Evolution and Revelation, called forth by a correspondence between Mr. Gladstone and Prof. Huxley. It shows the growth of his opinions and his abandonment of the old "Protestant orthodoxy" of Calvin. Chapter x., in his Life by G. A. Smith, is most instructive and interesting.

that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value; and gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me." But the prediction was not his, but Zechariah's. The mistake has caused much perplexity, even from the time of Origen, who endeavoured, as did Eusebius, S. Jerome, and S. Augustine after him, to find means of explaining it away.[1] There was surely no necessity to do this; for it was a case where literal accuracy was not essential to the moral teaching. It was a pure matter of history, and the Holy Spirit did not interpose to correct his memory, because it did not come within the scope of Inspiration.

Zech. xi. 12.

The Evangelists Divinely selected for their work.

Upon one point we may fairly conclude that the Holy Spirit exercised supreme control, viz., in the selection of the Evangelists. Just as Jesus Christ deliberately chose His first Apostles, by His own

[1] Some of the suggested methods are these: it was an early error in transcription; but if so, it would have been corrected as soon as it was discovered; or the prediction belonged to that division of Scripture, at the head of which Jeremiah's name was placed; but in that case, S. Matthew would have said, "in" not "by" Jeremiah -as in Hebrews iv. 7 we read, saying "in David," *i.e.* in that collection of Psalms which goes under his name. It is true, in the Inscription of the Psalms David is called the author of Psalms not from his pen; but S. Matthew's Gospel is authentic, the headings of the Psalms are of doubtful authenticity. It is far better to believe that S. Matthew quoted from memory, and, recalling the familiar chapters about the potter and his work, xviii. xix., concluded that this was part of them.

voice and will, to wait upon His Ministry, so after His departure He put it into the hearts of men by His Spirit, to preserve a record of it for all time; and seeing what a complex and manifold Life they had to describe, they were chosen for their special fitness to interpret different phases of it. No attempt was made to obtain a complete History or Biography;[1] that was beyond the capacities of any individual, and could only have been accomplished by such an overwhelming assistance, as would have destroyed any Evangelist's personality. What has been secured to us in the Providence of God is "a fourfold Gospel" exhibiting four phases of the Incarnate Word; and in the composition, the characteristic features of the several writers, arising from different callings, education, tastes and purposes, are constantly revealing themselves. The consideration of these is our appointed task in the following pages.

[1] There is no hint either in the Gospels or the Early Fathers that they contemplated writing anything which could ever be called "a Life" of Jesus. Herein modern writers present a striking contrast. "Life of Christ," "Vie de Jésus," "Das Leben Jesu," are familiar but misleading titles for their works.

III.

The Individuality of the Evangelist.

The influence of the Holy Spirit did not interfere with the writer's personality.

Inspiration, as we have stated, according to the true theory, did not interfere with the individuality of the writer, but left him free to follow out his own aim and purpose. The Evangelist was shown no supernatural vision of what he was to write, and was carried away by no rapture or divine ecstasy, like the prophets of the Old Dispensation, but received what was really a higher inspiration, being filled with the Holy Spirit,[1] by Whom he was enlightened and guided aright in what he wrote. His personality was never effaced or even weakened; provided it was good of its kind, it was controlled and elevated for its high purpose by the Divine Agent.

The Bishop of Durham has endorsed this view of the extent to which the natural properties of

[1] πνευματόφορος is the significant phrase by which the Divine influence was expressed. Theoph. of Antioch, *ad Autolicum*, ii. 22, iii. 12. Tertullian uses the expression *inundatos*, "flooded," which if pressed, implies more than he means: *Apol.* 18.

the inspired writers were preserved: "Even when they speak most emphatically *the words of the Lord*, they speak still as men living among men; and the eternal truths which they declare receive the colouring of the minds through which they pass. Everywhere there are traces of a personality not destroyed but even quickened by the action of the divine power,—of an individual consciousness not suspended but employed at every stage of the heavenly commission." The Study of the Gospels, p. 13.

When the Holy Ghost had put it into his heart to write the glad tidings of our Lord, the writer would recognise at once their complex nature and the impossibility of doing justice to the fulness of the Gospel. All that he had seen and heard and read satisfied him that he could do no more than exhibit to the world the picture of certain features and characteristics in the many-sided Life of a Perfect Being. The special phase which it was his province to portray had attracted him through a variety of circumstances, his own preference, his experience of the effect of what he had preached, the requirements of the persons with whom he had to deal, the traditional information that he had learned, or the documentary materials available for his instruction. Different minds received different

impressions, and adapted themselves to different conditions. The differences naturally resolved themselves into five distinct forms, two concerning our Lord's Nature—the Divine and the Human: three of His Office—King, Priest, and Prophet; but the last, as was not unnatural, when the Evangelists came to write about it, ceased to be a characteristic difference, and became common to them all. It would have been possible to have written of Jesus Christ without dwelling upon His Priesthood or His Royalty, but as He was teaching always and everywhere, His Prophetic office[1] could not but find an important place in every Gospel. So it was that Christ's Life was described under four phases, "according to" S. Matthew, S. Mark, S. Luke, and S. John, that is, as each one of these formed his several conception of it.

Individual conceptions of Christ's person.

These Four Gospels were soon associated with

[1] When we speak of Christ as a "Prophet," it is necessary to realise the proper meaning of the word. The Heb. נביא is "one who pours forth," utters, speaks; Aaron was the נביא of Moses, his spokesman, interpreter: Exod. iv. 16, vii. 1. Cf. also the famous prediction of the prophet, נביא, who "shall speak whatsoever I command him": Deut. xviii. 18. In the fulness of its meaning "the prophet" is one who interprets God's will whether as regards the past, present, or future. This is the New Testament sense of the title: one who is inspired to speak "for" God; but not necessarily "beforehand," though occasionally he did so speak, *e.g.* Agabus, Acts xxi. 10, 11. It was by virtue of His office as Prophet that Christ spake and taught with authority.

the four living creatures, which are spoken of in the Book of Ezekiel and the Revelation of S. John. In the prophetic vision of the Cherubim we read, "every one had four faces: the first face was the face of a cherub, and the second face was the face of a man, and the third the face of a lion, and the fourth the face of an eagle." In the vision of the four "living creatures,"[1] which the Apostle saw, "the first creature was like a lion, and the second creature like a calf, and the third creature had a face as of a man, and the fourth creature was like a flying eagle." Their symbolical character had been diversely interpreted by the Jewish writers, sometimes as representing the four leading Archangels, Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, and Uriel; sometimes the four Greater Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel; more generally, however, this fourfold Cherub was regarded as an emblem of the perfection of life under four aspects; "there are four which hold the supremacy in this world; among creatures, man; among birds, the eagle; among cattle, the ox; among beasts, the lion." It was doubtless this last interpretation which led to their appropriation

The Evangelistic Emblems.

Ezek. i. 5, 10; x. 14.

Rev. iv. 7.

Schöttgen, Horæ Hebr.

[1] In the Greek it is τέσσαρα ζῶα both here and in the LXX. of Ezek. i. 5. It is an illustration of the caprice of the translators of King James I. that in O. T. they rendered it "living creatures," in the N. T. "beasts." The R. V. is uniform as above.

Patristic interpretation of them.

adv. Hær. iii. 8.

to the four manifestations, which went to make up the Perfect Life, as exhibited in the Four Gospels. Irenæus was the first to connect them with the Evangelists, explaining the lion as the royalty;[1] the ox, the sacrificial and priestly side; the man, the humanity of Christ; the flying eagle, representing the manifestation of His Spirit, Which "hovers over and lights upon" the Church. He was followed by a host of other Fathers, SS. Athanasius, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great, though there was no exact uniformity in assigning the emblems to their proper Evangelists.

Another source of authority for the emblematic character of "the living creatures" of the Apocalypse may be found in the place assigned to them from a very early period in the Worship of the Altar.

Testimony of the Early Worship.

No doubt the influence of Irenæus had a considerable effect, for he was a pupil of Polycarp, who had sat at the feet of S. John, to whom the vision

Rev. iv. 7.

[1] The lion was regarded as an emblem of royalty, not only as "the king of beasts," but because it was on the standard of the Tribe of Judah, the Royal tribe. "Judah is my Lawgiver." "The Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David." The other three, the man, the calf, and the eagle, are said by Mede to have been the ensigns respectively of Reuben, Ephraim, and Dan.

was revealed. The belief that God supernaturally unveiled to His rapt Apostle the ritual worship of the New Covenant, in like manner as He had shewed to Moses in the mount a pattern of the Tabernacle, took such a firm hold of the early Christians, that, as soon as they were able to build churches, they framed them upon the model of the fourth and fifth chapters of the Revelation, and arranged the ritual, as far as possible, in accordance with that description. This was done at the beginning in both branches of the Church; and in the East, which has always been more conservative than the West, it is still preserved.

Exod. xxv. 40. Num. viii. 4.

Two striking features will serve to illustrate the correspondence. First the opening of the door, which shuts off the Sanctuary in the east, to disclose the Altar after the consecration of the Divine Mysteries, is in imitation of that part of S. John's vision, in which he says, "I looked, and behold, a door was opened in heaven; . . . and behold, a throne was set in heaven, and one sat on the throne"; for in the Eucharistic worship, the Altar is the Lord's throne, and His Presence there is that of Him, Whom S. John saw "on the throne."

The door of the Sanctuary.

Rev. iv. 1, 2.

The second illustration is taken from the solemn ceremony of placing the Four Gospels upon the

The Little Entrance.

Altar, and representing "the four beasts" of the Apocalypse, "in the midst of the throne and round about the throne." Like the beasts they are "full of eyes," being the source of divine illumination; and like them, they never cease saying "Holy, Holy, Holy," because in every page they utter the never-ceasing praises of Him "Which was and is and is to come." Now we may judge of the strength with which the Church held its conviction of the figurative character of this part of the Vision by the fact that they singled it out for a mark of distinction, by bringing in the Book of the Gospels with all the ceremony of "the Little Entrance,"[1] and placing it upon the Altar. It all tends to prove that the Early Church was satisfied that "the living creatures" were true emblems of the Gospels; for they would not admit anything unreal into their worship, still less accentuate it by special honour.

The evidence of Christian Art.

After the Fathers, Christian Art came in and stereotyped the connection, and by the seventh century these "Evangelistic emblems" were universally received, and entered largely into illuminated works of all kinds, in Churches, in stained

Mrs. Jameson's Sacred and Legendary Art.

[1] The procession was second only in importance to that of "the Great Entrance," when the Elements were brought in.

glass and mosaics, in books and pictures, and in the West with no variety of appropriation. The earlier variation in the appropriation of the emblems was found chiefly in regard to S. Matthew and S. Mark, some assigning the man to the former, some to the latter; and the same with the lion. Mainly through the influence of S. Jerome, and after him of S. Gregory the Great, the first Evangelist became almost always identified with the man, and the second with the lion.

It is not to be wondered at that there should have been so much diversity; for though each Evangelist had one idea of Christ's life prominent in his own mind, he did not by any means represent this exclusively. Indeed, he could not possibly contemplate His Person and work without being constantly made conscious of other phases than that which especially attracted him; and while painting one Face in the fourfold Portrait, he was obliged to introduce one or more of the other Faces into the picture, for as Ezekiel said, "they four had one likeness." We shall see hereafter how strikingly this is illustrated in the Gospels of S. Matthew and S. Luke. The former, as we shall try to show, describes generally the regal side of the Messianic office, but his Gospel abounds

Ezek. i. 16.

with testimony to the prophetic; while the latter was guided to emphasise the priestly character of Christ, opens his record with many details connected with His humanity, which belongs primarily to S. Mark. He knew that "every High Priest" is "taken from among men"; and that our High Priest was "touched with a feeling of our infirmities."

Heb. iv. 15; v. 1, 2.

S. Augustine's assignment of the Emblems. de Consensu Evang. 1.

As we propose to follow S. Augustine rather than S. Jerome, we give his general comment, and leave the argument to be worked out when we come to deal with the several Evangelists. "Those," he says, "who interpret the living creatures in the Apocalypse of the Evangelists, have more reason on their side when they refer the lion to Matthew, the man to Mark, the calf to Luke, and the eagle to John, than they who appropriate the man to Matthew, the eagle to Mark, and the lion to John"; and he thinks the error arose from a hasty conjecture. He then goes on to show that in the Revelation the lion is identified with the tribe of Judah, "the lion of the tribe of Judah prevailed"; and he confirms his view by showing how in this Gospel it is told that the Magi came from the East in search of a king, and Herod was struck with fear at the birth of the infant king. Then after showing

the fitness of the calf to set forth the sacerdotal office in S. Luke's Gospel, he proceeds to speak of S. Mark's object being "neither to draw out Christ's Royal descent nor His Priestly consecration, but simply what He did in the Form of Man." "These three living creatures," he adds, "the lion, the man, and the calf, walk on the earth; so the three Evangelists occupy themselves especially with what Christ did in the Flesh, and hand down the precepts which He delivered on the practical duties which we have to fulfil while we are in the flesh. But John (whose emblem is the Eagle) soars above the clouds of human infirmity, and looks with the keenest and steadiest gaze on the Light of the Immutable Truth."

The Emblems not uniformly appropriated.

There is, then, as we see, considerable diversity in the order of assigning the emblems; but it does not militate in any way against the fact which is implied by the heading of this chapter. The Gospels were universally held to be fourfold, descriptive of four different phases of Christ's Life, symbolised by these four figures. Each of the Evangelists undertook, through the influence of the Holy Spirit, the task of representing to the world that one which seemed most suitable, and this he made peculiarly his own.

S. Matthew

πρόσωπον τοῦ λέοντος ἐκ δεξιῶν.

ἰδοὺ ὁ λέων ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα, ἡ ῥίζα Δαυΐδ.

οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ βασίλευς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

IV.

The Authorship of the First Gospel.

ORIGEN gathered up into a single sentence almost all that is known for certain of the Author: "I have learnt from tradition, respecting the four Gospels, which are the only undisputed ones in the whole Church of God throughout the world, that the first was written according to Matthew, the same that was once a publican, but afterwards an Apostle of Jesus Christ."[1] If, as we hope, we may be able to confirm the belief that he was the same who is called Levi by S. Mark and S. Luke, the fact, in combination with his calling, lets in considerable light upon his life and character. A man's writings are often found to reflect these more or less clearly. It can hardly be otherwise in regard to his character, for it is out of the abundance of the heart that the mouth speaketh, and if what he says be sincere, it must be the expression of his thoughts

Undesigned coincidences often help to fix authorship.

[1] Euseb. *H. E.*, vi., xxv. He adds that he wrote it in Hebrew for the Jewish converts; but this, as we shall see, is open to question.

and feelings. In many cases, too, a man's calling or occupation leaves its mark upon what he writes, and that even though it be wholly unconnected with the subjects in hand. Such traces are called undesigned coincidences, and they have often helped very largely in determining the authorship of doubtful works. They abound in the Gospel of S. Matthew, and afford a very strong presumption that it was written by one who had filled the office of publican or tax-gatherer, and was called to the Apostleship from "the receipt of custom." No one, not even the money-changers, in Palestine had more to do with money than the publicans. All the revenues from the Roman Province passed through their hands, and in some cases even the subordinate officers amassed considerable fortunes. Now anything connected with money would have a natural attraction for a publican; and in this Gospel there is more frequent mention of money than in the others, and not only so, but more and rarer coins are introduced.

ix. 9.

The publican's familiarity with money.

In S. Mark's Gospel we read only of three coins and those the poorest; the mite, the farthing, and the penny.[1] S. Peter, a poor fisherman from the

[1] Denarius, the Roman silver penny of ten asses; about the same value as the Greek drachma.

lake side, talked with S. Mark only of the coins with which he was familiar. S. Luke goes further, for he speaks even of pounds or minas; and this is what we should expect, when we consider his intimacy with S. Paul and their travels in Greece, where the mina was in general circulation. But S. Matthew mentions more coins, and deals with those of the highest value current at the time, and not once only but again and again.

Money little noticed in the second and third Gospels; and only the smaller coins.

The difference is shown in a striking manner in the several records of our Lord's directions to the Apostles when He sent them out on their first mission. In S. Mark we read that He charged them "that they should take nothing for their journey . . . no money in their purse."[1] In the original it is no "brass" or "copper." In S. Luke, "take nothing for your journey . . . neither money";[2] but in the original it is "silver." In S. Matthew, however, where in all probability we have the exact injunctions as they were given in detail, and fully appreciated by one who knew the whole monetary coinage of the country, "neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses."[3]

S. Mark vi. 8.

S. Luke ix. 3.

S. Matt. x. 9.

Again, it is in perfect harmony with the above

[1] *μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκόν.* [2] *μήτε ἀργύριον.*
[3] *μὴ κτήσησθε χρυσὸν μηδὲ ἄργυρον μηδὲ χαλκόν.*

rables of
e talents,
iii. 23.
v. 15.

distinction that the two parables of the talents should find a place in S. Matthew's Gospel, though neither of them receives any notice from the other Evangelists. A talent was worth some seventy times as much as "the pound" of S. Luke, or above eight thousand times more than "the penny" of S. Mark. The amount of the debt, viz., ten thousand talents, which was owed to the king by one of his servants, was quite within the grasp of a publican, who was responsible for enormous sums, but it made little or no impression upon the common mind.

All this helps us largely to identify Matthew the Evangelist with Matthew the publican.

he identifi-
ation of the
uthor with
evi.

If we are able to go further and identify Matthew the publican with Levi, we may draw from the circumstances some interesting evidence touching an important feature in his character, viz., his modesty and self-depreciation. It was not uncommon in the early years of Christianity for a man to assume a new name on his conversion. S. Peter and S. Paul are the most familiar examples. If the same course was adopted by Levi, its etymology bespoke his gratitude for the change, for Matthew, like Theodore or Nathanael, signifies "the gift of God."

Throughout the Gospel S. Matthew suppresses

in a marked degree his own personality; indeed we cannot mention any important work in which the author has succeeded in so completely effacing himself. His humility finds expression in the order in which he is placed in the Apostolic Lists in the Gospels; he is always coupled with S. Thomas, though S. Mark and S. Luke give him the precedence, while he places himself second. S. Matthew's self-effacement.

Again, if there is any truth in the tradition that it was from his personal history that our Lord drew the materials for his parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, it is very significant of his modesty, that of the two Gospels which give the largest place to parables, this should be recorded in the third and not in the first.

Now let us see what bearing the identification of Matthew and Levi has upon the point. The facts are these: S. Matthew records the call and conversion of a publican having his own name; S. Mark and S. Luke repeat the same of a man named Levi, the whole circumstances being precisely similar. In all the narratives the call is preceded by the cure of the paralytic and followed by a feast in the publican's house. How, then, can we account for the use of different names? We must realise first what the office of the so-called "publican" was in The circumstances of the call of Matthew and Levi identical.

The publican's office and character.

Palestine; for the term has been largely misunderstood. Publican was in fact an honourable title, borne by the rich capitalists of Rome belonging chiefly to the Equestrian order, who undertook to farm the provincial taxes, paying a sum down at the time of contract into the public Treasury—*in publicum*—from which they were called "publicans." There was nothing to be ashamed of in such a transaction, though from time to time we do meet with uncomplimentary language about them, in consequence of the hard terms which they were tempted to exact from the subordinates whom they either employed as agents to collect in their behalf, or to whom they sublet the taxes. It was, however, these latter, usually natives of the province,[1] who are so often mentioned in the New Testament and with well-deserved severity. Living at a distance from their masters they used every opportunity of abusing their powers by extortion and misrepresentation, and were universally hated. They were like "the excisemen"[2] in our own country.

[1] The agents were called *portitores*. They overcharged: S. Luke iii. 13. They brought false charges: S. Luke xix. 8. It became a proverb: πάντες τελῶναι πάντες ἅρπαγες.

[2] "Excise. A hateful tax levied upon commodities and adjudged, not by the common judges of property, but by wretches hired by those to whom excise was paid."—Johnson's *Dict. of the Eng. Lang.*

In Palestine the evil was aggravated. The Jew had an innate conviction that he owed tribute to no earthly ruler; he was the subject of God and God alone; and history relates how often the nation rose in revolt, rather than pay the tax, which bespoke their subjugation. It was "the very spot where the Roman chain galled—the visible proof of their degraded state." Moreover the hardship was emphasised by Jewish agents, their own flesh and blood, being employed to exact payment. None but the lowest would accept the office, and they were invariably regarded as the outcasts and pariahs of society, and joined with cutthroats and robbers, sinners and harlots.

S. Matt. xxii. 15.

Peculiar Jewish hatred of the publican.

Maimonides, Bab. Talm. Sanhed. fol. 25, 2. Lightf. Hor. Talm. in Matt. v. 46.

In the light of all this it is easy to understand why S. Mark and S. Luke should be anxious to disguise the fact that their brother Evangelist had belonged to such a class. All that they desired was to show the power of God, which could convince even a publican of the wickedness of his calling, and lead him to abandon such a discreditable means of livelihood. So it was that they simply stated the historic fact of a publican's conversion and gave the name which he bore at the time, thirty years or more before. They felt, no doubt, that there was little chance of its being

Reasons why this publican has different names given him in the Gospels.

associated with the Apostle, whose title of infamy had passed into oblivion, and who was then invariably known by his Apostolic name of Matthew.

S. Matthew, however, felt differently himself; he had no wish to suppress his former disreputable life, now that he had long renounced it, and done his best to atone for its iniquity. Indeed, he desired to make known by a living example what the grace of God could do: to point to himself as a miracle of mercy: for nothing could be impossible if Levi the publican had passed into Matthew the Apostle.

Further proof of S. Matthew's humility.

A comparison of the different accounts of the immediate consequences of this conversion will illustrate still more the humility and self-suppression of S. Matthew. The first Evangelist states very simply that on hearing the call of Christ, the publican "arose and followed Him," and that as he sat at meat "in the house" many publicans and sinners shared in the meal. S. Mark gives the further information that it was "in his house"; while S. Luke is even more explicit, adding that "he left all," and that he "made Him a great feast in his own house." S. Matthew has nothing to say about the sacrifice which his conversion entailed; but S. Luke was careful to

record it. The famous Venetian painter[1] has caught the spirit of the latter, and has endeavoured to express on canvas how much was involved in the statement, "he left all"; for nothing can exceed the splendour of "The Banquet," in which he is depicted as bidding good-bye to his old life and friends.

This identification of Matthew and Levi and the different mode of recording the episode of his conversion were used by a great teacher in the Early Church to inculcate the duty of a charitable forbearance in speaking of the faults and failings of others, more especially repentant sinners, and in drawing a veil over anything which might awaken a memory of their sin and shame. Be as severe as you will towards self, but always loving and tender to others. S. Chrysostom.

[1] Paul Veronese's "Banquet" in the Academy at Venice.

V.

Jewish Features in the Gospel.

THERE was a widespread tradition in the Early Church that the Apostle wrote his Gospel in "the Hebrew tongue," *i.e.* Aramaic, which belongs to the Hebrew stem, but is a distinct dialect. This had been adopted by the Jews in their Babylonian exile, and after their return from captivity became the vernacular of the nation. In later times, however, it has been thought that the belief that S. Matthew wrote in Hebrew arose out of a confusion of his Gospel with an apocryphal treatise entitled "the Gospel according to the Hebrews."[1]

S. Matthew's Gospel in Hebrew.

[1] There is no doubt there was much similarity between them, but there were also wide differences. The Apocryphal Gospel contains unknown sayings of our Lord, *e.g.*, "Lately, My Mother, the Holy Ghost carried Me by one of the hairs of My head to the Great Mount Tabor": Origen *in Joann.* tom. ii. c. vi. Our Lord's conversation with the Rich Young Man contains this addition—"How can you think that you have obeyed all, when it is written in the Law, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; and yet so many of thy brethren, sons of Abraham, are clothed in rags, dying of hunger, while thy house is filled with goods and nothing given?": id. *in Matt.* tom. xv.

It is possible that he may have written an Hebrew original, and afterwards translated it himself into Greek; and the translation survived while the original was lost. There is an exact parallel to this in the case of Josephus; he tells us himself in his preface to *The Wars*, that he composed the history first in the language of his countrymen, that is, Aramaic, and then translated it into Greek. The former, however, like the Hebrew original of S. Matthew, is no longer extant. We could not forbear introducing a question, which has at different times kindled much interest; but we are compelled to leave it as an unsolved problem. On the one hand, the testimony of antiquity favours a Hebrew original;[1] on the other, the phenomena[2] of the Gospel in its present form are inconsistent with the supposition that it was a translation.

The belief, however, in a Hebrew original is not necessary for the insistence that the Gospel was composed, in the first instance, for Jewish readers. Palestine was at this time bilingual, the more

The inhabitants of Palestine bilingual.

[1] Cf. Papias apud Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39; Irenæ. *Hær.* iii. 1; Euseb. *H. E.* v. 10, vi. 25; Epiph. *Hær.* xxix. 9; Hieron., Greg. Naz., Chrysost., and Augustine.

[2] There is the use of paronomasia, κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει αὐτούς, xxi. 41, and plays on words, μὴ βαττολογήσητε . . . ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ, vi. 7: λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοί, xxiv. 7, which are rarely found in translations.

educated people using Greek, while the lower classes, though they understood Greek, yet among themselves spoke Aramaic. There is an incident which well illustrates this recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. When S. Paul was in Jerusalem, and a great tumult arose, he addressed the mob in the Hebrew tongue: it is quite clear that they expected him to speak Greek to them, and would have understood him, though they were surprised and delighted when he used their own language. If, therefore, it could be proved beyond dispute that S. Matthew wrote in Greek, it would not militate at all against the belief that he had Jews especially in his mind.

Acts xxii. 2.

Knowledge of Jewish customs and places assumed.

This is established in many other ways; we may see it incidentally in a variety of details; the Gospel presupposes a knowledge of Jewish customs; it speaks, *e.g.*, of the disciples transgressing "the tradition of the elders, for they wash not their hands when they eat bread." There is no such explanation of the times and manner of washing such as Gentiles required.

xv. 2.

S. Mark vii. 3-5.

An acquaintance also is assumed with the geography of Palestine, its natural productions, and local peculiarities. The rending of the Veil in the Temple, unrecorded by others, could have no special

interest to any but Jews. The strictly Jewish formula, "the kingdom of heaven," is spoken of as many as thirty-two times, though it has no place in the other Gospels, where "the kingdom of God" is always substituted for it. Twelve times, again, S. Matthew reminds the Jews that their Scriptures had been fulfilled in the life of Him of Whom he was writing.

The first miracle attributed to Jesus by S. Matthew is the healing of a leper. It is preceded both in S. Mark's and S. Luke's Gospels by several others; and S. John says expressly that the turning of the water into wine at Cana in Galilee was the beginning of Christ's miracles. How was it, then, that S. Matthew gave precedence to the cure of leprosy? It seems as though he desired to impress upon his readers as soon as possible the truth of our Lord's Divine mission. The Jews had an intense conviction that leprosy was a direct punishment sent by God, and incurable save by His interposition. "Am I God," said the King of Israel, "to kill and to make alive, that this man doth send unto me to recover a man of his leprosy?" They forbade a physician so much as to attempt a cure.[1]

Jewish views of leprosy.

2 Kings v. 7.

[1] Cf. Rabbi Menachem on Lev. xiii., quoted by Hammond *in loc.*, and Townson on the Gospels, ii. 127.

We can understand, then, why S. Matthew, if he were writing for Jews, should give such prominence to this miracle as corroborative evidence that He Who wrought it came from God. There is an exact parallel in S. Luke's Gospel; the first miracle which he recorded was the cure of "a man
iv. 33. which had a spirit of an unclean devil." He was writing for Gentiles, and desired to give them a proof at the outset that Christ had power over the demons or evil spirits, whom they so greatly feared that they worshipped them.

There is also one passage, almost at the beginning, which illustrates very forcibly and at greater length its strictly Jewish character. If we compare
The Sermon on the Mount and on the Plain. "the Sermon on the Mount," as reported by S. Matthew, with "the Sermon on the Plain," which we owe to S. Luke, there is much that is common to both; but there is also not a little that is not so. This phenomenon admits of two possible explanations: either, like the perfect Scribe, who brings out of his treasury things new and old, our Blessed Lord repeated Himself more or less, but, seeing the fitness of things, only in so far as what He had said on a former occasion was suited to His present hearers;—or possibly He delivered the Sermon once for all. It was a long one, embracing

all that is recorded in both places, but the two Evangelists were guided by the Holy Ghost to report such parts respectively as were appropriate only to those whom each had especially in mind. S. Matthew, having before him the people of the Jews, was careful to place on record for their instruction all that legislation which was based on the Mosaic Code and strictly Jewish, and to point out, as none other does, that Jesus had Himself declared that He came "not to destroy, but to fulfil[1] the Law."

In the twenty-third chapter S. Matthew introduces our Lord speaking to the people about the faults and failings of those who sat in Moses' seat, and while calling upon them to obey their precepts, denounces certain of their practices, well known to Jews but unnoticed by others, by which they made a great show of sanctity amongst their brethren; "they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments; and love . . . greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi." xxiii. 5. 7.

So again in His prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, the direction to pray that their flight

[1] πληρῶσαι, *i.e.* not so much to fulfil as to "fill up" and develop in all the fulness of which it was capable.

should not be in the winter, "neither on the Sabbath day" was full of significance to the Jew. S. Mark only records the prayer that it might not be "in the winter." The addition of S. Matthew was inserted to arrest the attention of a people to whom
Neh xii. 19. the Sabbath was so sacred that none might go in or out of the city; if they should forget the prohibition, and attempt to escape, they might find the gates closed against them.[1]

The strongest evidence, however, is to be found in the dominant purpose of the whole Gospel, which was to furnish a comprehensive proof that Jesus was the promised Messiah, and that He fulfilled especially that part of the Messianic hope which the Jews exalted above all else. His Royal prerogative to be a King of the house and lineage of David. This will be unfolded at length in a future chapter, when we have shown the bearing upon the subject before us which may be gathered from the frequent reference to the influence and authority of dreams.

[1] If it be said that the case alluded to in Nehemiah was a special one, it only tends to show the sanctity of the day. What happened at one time was quite possible at another.

VI.

The Jewish Estimate of Dreams.

The notice of dreams and supernatural interpositions through visions of the night, which is very frequent in this Gospel, can hardly be accidental; for such a mode of communicating God's will to man is passed over by the other Evangelists in comparative silence. S. Matthew felt that the attention of the Jews, for whom he wrote primarily, would be at once arrested by the mention of them. Some of the greatest truths had been disclosed to the Hebrew patriarchs as they lay asleep; their prophets listened for God's commands, not only when He spoke to them mouth to mouth; they lived in the constant expectation that they might learn His will in their sleeping as well as their wakeful thoughts. He had Himself prepared them for it, saying to Moses and Aaron and Miriam, "Hear now My words; if there be a prophet among you, I, the Lord, will make myself known unto him in a vision and will speak unto him in a

Importance attached to dreams in the Old Testament.

Numb. xii. 6.

dream." It was said also of Saul, after the death of Samuel, that when he inquired of God the usual methods of learning His will failed; and they are thus spoken of, "neither by dreams, nor by vision, nor by prophets." Again, when Joel predicted the outpouring of the Spirit in Messianic times, he clothed his prophecy in the familiar imagery of his own surroundings: "your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions." The prophet selected dreams as one of the recognised vehicles for making known the will of God; he spoke in language which they would at once understand; it is no contradiction that this exact method of illumination is unnoticed when S. Peter says the prediction was fulfilled in the New Dispensation. Methods may change with changing circumstances, principles alone are fixed.[1]

1 Sam. xxviii. 6.

Joel ii. 28.

There can be no doubt, then, that the Hebrew mind was strongly impressed with the importance of dreams. S. Matthew, therefore, writing for Jews, not unnaturally emphasised the fact that some of the most striking events which he was narrating

[1] There is nothing to indicate a revelation by dreams in Acts ii., but we do find in x. 10, and xxii. 17, that God made known His will by a trance, *i.e.* in the nature of a vision.

had been revealed to men through the medium of dreams. It would create a strong presumption in the truth of his story. In doing this he dwelt upon the manner in which God had revealed to Joseph the fact of Mary's supernatural conception: "the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary, thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost." Again, he told how the Child's life had been preserved, and the flight into Egypt undertaken, at the bidding of an angel that appeared unto him in a dream; and further, that the return from that country was directed by precisely the same means. Yet once more it was, he said, in consequence of a warning that came to him in a dream, that he turned away from the dominions of Archelaus, and found protection from danger and persecution in the region of Galilee.

All these instances are associated with Christ's birth and early life. S. Matthew was careful to describe them in such a way that the Jews might be convinced that supernatural methods of Divine communications were adopted from the very beginning in connection with the Messiah of Whom he wrote. Again, when he recorded the dream of

Pilate's wife's interposition.

xxvii. 19.

Claudia Procla[1] on the eve of the Crucifixion, he hoped to move his readers to realise how great the displeasure of God must have been towards those who compassed Christ's death. Though He had refused to answer Saul, and had ceased for centuries to speak to His people by Urim and Thummim, or vision or prophet, He broke the silence of eternity for an unjust judge, and tried to avert the calamity into which he was hastening, by sending a supernatural dream to terrify his wife. Like every other divine message, intended as a warning to save the Jews from ruin, it found their ears closed and their hearts hardened.

In the light of all that is revealed on this subject in the first Gospel, it is impossible not to be strengthened in the conviction that the Evangelist wrote primarily at least for his own countrymen.

[1] Nothing more is known of her than that this was her name, and that she was a proselyte to Judaism: Gosp. of Nicodemus, ii. 1. Her presence with her husband in his province was contrary to law, but it was sometimes relaxed: Tac. *Ann.* iii. 33, 34. Claudia is canonised by the Greek Church.

VII.

The Fulfilment of Messianic Prophecy.

The primary aim of S. Matthew was to prove to the Jews that Jesus Christ was their promised Messiah—that mysterious Person to Whom all the prophets gave witness, in Whom the spirit of prophecy found its highest and fullest expression. No doubt all the Evangelists knew this; but it was necessary to emphasise it in writing to a people whose saints and seers had been chosen by God to reveal His will, and to whom He had assigned the guardianship of the sacred deposit in which it was enshrined. It was calculated to claim their attention at once, when the Apostle made known the circumstances of Christ's Birth, all of which he pointed out were so ordered as to fulfil what was written, and even more, as he went on to show, that it was equally true at every stage of His life and work, in His rejection, His Death and Passion, and in His Resurrection.

The Messianic hope fulfilled in Jesus.

Now the official title for this predicted Person was the Messiah, the Christ, the Anointed; and He was always spoken of as *the* Messiah, because He was expected to gather up into Himself the three important offices into which men were inducted by the ceremony of unction, viz., the regal, the sacerdotal, and the prophetic. Thus it is
1 Sam. x. 1. written of Saul, the king, "Samuel took a vial of oil and poured it upon his head": of Aaron and his
Exod. xl. 15. sons, "Thou shalt anoint them . . . that they may minister unto Me in the priest's office"; "and
1 Kings xix. 16. Elisha the son of Shaphat of Abel-meholah shalt thou anoint to be prophet in thy room."

Our Blessed Lord had His forerunners in each of these Messianic offices, but the character which laid the strongest hold upon the Jewish mind and affections was the Regal. Indeed at last the expectation of a mighty king, who should restore the independence of their nation, and make it once more a great material power, so fascinated them that every other aspect of Messianic hope was overshadowed. The Malcha[1] Messhika was the title always upon their lips, to the complete exclusion of the other which bespoke Christ's office as their

[1] The King Messiah. They rarely spoke of the Messiah without the royal prefix.

great High Priest or the supreme Teacher of the Divine Law.

No wonder, then, that S. Matthew, himself a Jew, deeply conversant with his countrymen's aspirations, and realising how far they had fallen short of the true ideal, should write his Gospel to show that Jesus Christ fulfilled all prophecy, and had set up such a spiritual kingdom as had been foretold, though their rulers and guides had lost sight of its true character.

Christ's Prophetic character has no special exponent.

While, however, S. Matthew's dominant aim is to exhibit the ideal King, he lays more stress than the other Evangelists do upon Christ as a Teacher fulfilling the Messianic gift of Prophecy. Possibly, if a fifth Gospel had been written, the Holy Spirit would have guided its author to make Christ in His Prophetic character the central figure; and thus the manifoldness of His life and work, His Humanity, Divinity, Royalty, Priesthood, and Prophetic office would have had each its own historian and exponent; but the reason is not far to seek why it was ordered otherwise. The one office which our Lord was always exercising was that of teaching, revealing the Divine will; and this finds its fittest expression not in any one Evangelist but in all. The two who were "eye-witnesses and

ministers of the Word" naturally recorded more than the others of what He said and taught, but they differ widely from each other in their mode of treatment. It was with S. Matthew and S. John, as it had been in the old Schools of Philosophy; there was exoteric and esoteric teaching. S. Matthew—and herein S. Mark and S. Luke followed in his steps—recorded that which Jesus had taught the multitudes, and which was intelligible to all; S. John revealed the hidden truths that had been fully spoken of to him, who lay upon Christ's bosom.

It is possible, then, to find traces in all the Gospels of the teaching of Him Who spake as never man spake, but it is especially interesting to see how in each there is some other side of His Person, which stands out in special prominence.

The Royalty of Christ.

In S. Matthew's Gospel it is Christ's Royalty, from which, as we have shown, the lion, the king of beasts, was assigned to him as the appropriate Evangelistic emblem. It may be we have sometimes wondered why a message of glad tidings should open with a long catalogue of names, which have interested people so little that the authorities of the Church at the last Revision of the Lectionary directed that they should no longer be read in the appointed

Lesson of the day. But what are they? A table of royal succession or heirship to the throne of David.[1] The Evangelist intended them to give the keynote of all that follows; to show at the very outset that the Messiah of Whom he wrote was not only of the chosen seed of Abraham, but heir of the kingdom, drawing His human descent from a line of kings which reaches back to the great king David.

His Birth is followed by the visit of the Magi, whom tradition has clothed in all the emblems of royalty; and they made it known at once that the object of their quest across the trackless desert was to find Him Who was born "King of the Jews." Without any hesitation they prostrated themselves before the Infant Jesus, and presented the gold which betokened His Royalty. Here, too, we are told of the alarm of Herod at the birth of a rival king, and of the prophecy which the chief priests and scribes repeated to him, that a Governor would come out of Bethlehem who should rule over Israel. The Magi's visit is followed in the narrative by

[1] It is the genealogy of the Son of David, but it is traced back to Abraham, to whom the promises were made. The second division alone gives the line of actual kings from David to the Captivity. The third division gives the lawful heirs to the throne if it had continued.

the picture of the great forerunner going out into the wilderness and proclaiming with a herald's voice the startling message. "Prepare ye the way of the Lord." S. Matthew alone alleges the reason; it was because the King was coming: "the kingdom of heaven is at hand." In the next chapter we are told that our Lord opened His own Mission by recalling to His hearers the very words of the Baptist's cry: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Then as we take our stand with the multitudes on the slopes of Mount Hattin,[1] we learn before anything else who are the subjects of the King, the rightful citizens of the Divine kingdom: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven"; and then the Speaker goes on at once with a voice of supreme authority to unfold its laws.

Parables of the Kingdom.

Again S. Matthew puts the same fact more forcibly forward by a remarkable group of parables in the thirteenth chapter, all of which speak of the nature of His kingdom. So also in the parables

[1] Kurun Hattin, the Horns of Hattin, lies by the road from Tabor to Damascus, where it crosses the plain of Ard el Humma. It rises about 100 feet only from the road, though it is 4000 feet above the sea. Near this Saladin gained a decisive victory over the Crusaders in 1187, and drove them out of Palestine. Ritter's *Comparative Geography*, ii. 310.

of the Marriage Feast, the Ten Virgins, and the Talents, all associated as they are with the declaration of the kingdom. Further, in one of these parables the aim of S. Matthew is distinctly brought out through an important detail. Men have commonly identified the parable of the Marriage Feast of the King's son with that of the Great Supper; but there are many considerations connected with time and place which tend to distinguish them from each other. If we separate them, S. Matthew, the messenger of the kingdom, fulfils his purpose in selecting as most worthy of record that which is described as a Royal banquet. S. Luke, having no special interest in the Royalty of Christ, has left us the account of that which was given by "a certain man."

S. Matt. xxii. 1-14. S. Luke xiv. 19-24.

It points in the same direction that while S. Mark and S. Luke, with one exception, speak many times of the message which was to be published abroad simply as "the Gospel," S. Matthew is careful to give the more significant definition of it, "the gospel of the kingdom."[1]

Thus far for the explicit teaching of the first

[1] Only once does he speak of the Gospel without the addition, and there it is doctrinally unnecessary, for he is only saying how Mary's act of anointing would be perpetuated, "wherever this gospel shall be preached": xxvi. 13.

Gospel on the Royalty of Christ; the same conception of His office is indirectly shown in a variety of ways, especially by the air of sovereign authority which surrounds His actions as they are described in these pages. We see it illustrated at the very beginning, when, as He opens His teaching, He sets Himself above the great lawgiver of Israel, "ye have heard that it was said by them of old time": "but I say unto you"; and so again and again all through the Sermon on the Mount.

His supreme and absolute Sovereignty.

S. Augustine sees a token of his majestic authority in the attitude of sitting down to preach as He is represented by S. Matthew, in comparison with what we read in S. Luke, where it is said, "He came down with them and stood in the plain." Again, He rises superior to all the recognised teachers after Moses. His interpretation of the Law, wherever he dealt with it, admitted of no dispute, and needed no corroborative voice to commend it. The Jewish Scribes rarely gave an exposition without appealing to the wisest of their predecessors, Judah or Meir, Hillel or Shammai, and for every decision they adduced a precedent; but our Lord spake with a voice of supreme command, "as never man spake" before or since. Look again at his denunciations on the Pharisees for

v. 1.

vi. 17.

their frightful hypocrisy in every condition of life, always walking in a vain show, careless of reality, drawing dangerous distinctions in their obligations and oaths; all this casuistry He swept away with the invincible authority of absolute truth.

His claims to be the Final Judge of all.

We read the same evidence in His claim to be the supreme Judge and Arbiter of the final destinies of men. "When the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory; and before Him shall be gathered all nations"; . . . "Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." . . . "Then shall He say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." xxv. 31.

Then, as we stand with Him on the Mount of the Ascension, we hear the echo of all His claims to the highest prerogatives of sovereignty gathered up into a single sentence, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and earth." xxviii. 18.

Now there is nothing like such convincing proof of Christ's Regal dignity and office in the other Gospels; but while S. Matthew never loses sight of it, he shows at the same time that Messianic

prophecy foreshadowed not only glory and honour but shame and suffering. The motto of the coming King, if it had been written in a single sentence, would have been simply this. "No cross no crown." First "despised and rejected of men." "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," and then hailed as King. The very idea was abhorrent to the Jewish mind, and they used every expedient to escape the predicted union of shame and glory, death and victory. At last they built up a belief in two Messiahs to reconcile the conflicting characters; one of the House of Joseph, the other of the House of David. The former was expected to appear in Galilee, and after gathering together the lost tribes of Israel to march on Jerusalem, where he was to receive the submission of the Messiah of the House of David, and, after uniting forces, to subdue the power of Gog and Magog who represented the heathen. Then the descendant of Joseph was destined to die as a sacrifice for the sins of Jeroboam; and his rival would be left to reign in matchless glory and splendour over an united and prosperous people.

The Jews' abhorrence of a suffering Messiah.

S. Matthew overthrows this theory, and shows that the spirit of prophecy knew nothing of a divided Messiahship, but combined in One Person suffering and humiliation with honour and exalta-

tion; and so, at the very opening of His career, side by side with His Royal descent and the homage of the Magi, he records the massacre of the innocents and the flight into Egypt; and the return from that country to His fatherland is followed immediately by a notice of the contempt and dishonour that is implied in the prediction: "He ii. 23. shall be called a Nazarene."

So we see how S. Matthew fulfilled the main purpose with which we believe he entered upon his work, and revealed to future ages the Regal office of Jesus Christ, the true Messiah of Hebrew prophecy.

VIII.

The Kingdom of Christ's Church.

THERE is a correlative truth to the Royalty of Christ, viz., that the Church which He came to found is a kingdom; not merely an aggregate of believers or "congregation of faithful men," drawn from all parts of the world, but an organisation and dominion controlled and governed by a King, and most aptly described under the figure of a kingdom, and that not only of this world but "a kingdom of heaven." The expression is peculiar to S. Matthew, and though not always restricted to one meaning, yet in its fullest and truest conception it is that spiritual realm over which Christ reigns as Supreme Head, which we call the Church, visible and invisible; for though it is described as "of heaven," it does not imply that it has no sphere on earth, only that it is such in its character and object, as in its ultimate destiny.

The meaning of the phrase, the Kingdom of Heaven.

Some difficulty has been found in applying the term to the Church before it was established; "the

kingdom of heaven is," not will be, "likened"; but He Who used the description knew the end from the beginning, and foresaw what its future would rapidly become. It is, moreover, by no means easy to fix the exact date when the Church had its beginning; its design was made, and the foundation lines drawn out by Christ, and for this reason He is called its Founder, and though it be true that the Divine breath was not breathed into the organisation till Pentecost, it existed in embryo, as soon as men and women joined together in following Christ.

It is worthy of notice that S. Matthew is the only Evangelist who speaks definitely of "the Church," telling how Jesus Christ described its future foundation upon the rock, and promised to S. Peter, the rockman, as representing the Apostles, full authority to admit or exclude members, and to make its laws: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." Further, He reminded him in so many words at that important crisis of what hitherto he had only indicated in parable: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom," *i.e.* His Church. xvi. 18. xviii. 17.

S. Matthew has preserved for us much of the teaching in which Christ foreshadowed the future Parables concerning the Church.

characteristics of the Church in what are sometimes called "the parables of the kingdom." In the parable of the grain of mustard-seed He foretold its growth and development by its own inherent nature and capacities; and this is exactly described by comparing it to the growth of that particular tree, whose ultimate greatness is most disproportioned to the seed from which it sprang. The mustard-seed was used by the Jews almost proverbially to express something exceedingly small. What could represent more accurately the apparent insignificance of the first beginnings of Christ's Church? Again, what appropriateness there is in the language, "when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof"! It is destined to be realised to the letter when the great kingdom of the Church shall provide shelter and protection for all the nations of the whole earth.

S. Matt. xiii. 32.

Look again at another parable: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened." What an anticipation of the diffusion and all-pervading influence of the Church, which is "mighty in operation," to purify and

xiii. 33.

ultimately gather into itself all mankind! Again, in the parables of the Tares and the Net we read of striking characteristics of the Church in its probation and its perfected state. They both exhibit in different ways the present commingling of good and evil, and the final separation, when all that is bad will be destroyed or cast out, and the Church of God "will be all righteous."

Now we shall understand generally what this figure implies, as descriptive of the Church, if we put before our eyes an earthly kingdom.[1] The king upon his throne is the centre of unity; the sphere of his dominion, large or small, is the boundary of his rule; he has armies to defend the integrity of the empire, or, it may be, to extend its borders; ministers and ambassadors, with delegated powers, to make known his will and enforce his laws; and subjects bound to their sovereign by ties of fealty and patriotism. In all this there are exact correspondences in the spiritual kingdom of Christ's Church; but there are points in which no kingdom of this world can adequately represent it; the Church has for its King One Who

What is meant by describing the Church as a kingdom.

[1] I have set this out in full in a sermon entitled "The kingdom of Christ" in an Advent Series preached in behalf of Church Reform. Published by Longmans, 1898.

is God as well as man; His dominions are visible and invisible; His agents are not only men but angels, and His subjects the living and the dead—dead at least as we account death, but alive unto God—they are partly militant here on earth, they are partly expectant now in Paradise.

Now there are two important truths which all this ought to impress upon us very forcibly, viz., the unity and the dignity of the Church. "I believe in one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."

The unity of the Catholic Church.

It was intended, as the figure of a kingdom involves, to be "at unity in itself." All the members of the Church, as subjects of a King and citizens of a kingdom, must be of one heart and soul touching its essential principles and prerogatives. No man liveth to himself alone; the prosperity of the commonwealth, not private interest, is to be the dominant aim of every subject. It is only when this is sacrificed and individual freedom and personal ambition assert themselves that schism comes in, and its inevitable consequence, "a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand."

But it is often said that the Church has failed herein to rise to the unity of a kingdom. The East is separated from the West, and has been for wellnigh a thousand years; the West again is

divided into Latin and English; our own Branch of the Western Church is sorely tried and troubled by divisions; but if there were none of these things, the unity of the Church would be a visible fact and not, as it is, an Article of faith. We may find, it may be, some solution of the difficulty in the distinction which has been drawn by one of our ablest preachers[1] between subjective and objective unity. "Subjective unity exists in a Church where all the members communicate freely with each other, join in the same Services, kneel at the same Altar, sympathise with and support one another. . . . Objective unity may continue where this free mutual intercourse is suspended; and yet, although they hold aloof, the sundered parties agree in the great principles of their law. A war between two nations destroys their subjective unity, as it makes all good offices to cease, but it does not and cannot annihilate the objective unity, which flows from the fact that they are all children of Adam. And exactly similar is the case with the Church of Christ. Evil men and evil tongues have stirred up strife, and the household of faith is miserably divided. . . . The infidel points at us, as

[1] The late Bishop Woodford: *Holy Week Lectures on the latter part of the Apostles' Creed*, p. 28.

a kingdom broken and hastening to decay, and all the while from every altar-side ascends to heaven the cry of Faith,—'I believe in One Catholic and Apostolic Church.' Faith, that is, recognises unity beneath the outward rent."

We can give an illustration from the natural world which may help to remove the difficulties that perplex us, arising out of the disputes which force themselves upon our notice. It may be that we have stood on some headland overlooking the sea in the midst of a fierce storm of wind; we have seen the whole surface lashed into fury, wave dashing against wave, far as the eye could reach nothing but conflict: and then we suddenly remembered what we had read about "the Science of the Waves," and we passed in imagination below the surface, and there we found to our amazement the great deep tides rolling on calm and undisturbed, as though no storm or tempest were raging overhead. Even so it may be in the Catholic Church, if we will only get away from the turmoil and disputes that are so rife around and about us; if we will close our ears to the bitter recriminations of this party or that, and fix our mind on the fundamental principles, we shall find that after all the Church is one, one because it is Christ's Body, one in its belief in its

Divine origin and constitution, one in its acceptance of the one Baptism for the remission of sins, one in its recognition of the all-binding Eucharistic Bread, one in its clinging to the only Name whereby we can be saved. And so we go away comforted by the knowledge, that after all there is enough to enable us to say, not it is true that we see, but that we do believe in the Unity of the Catholic Church.

The dignity of the Church.

Consider, again, the dignity which attaches to the Church as a kingdom. It is no mere association of faithful men eager to work out their own salvation in self-chosen ways, but a vast organisation governed and controlled in all its parts by constitutional laws, in which the will and authority of the King is supreme. There is ample scope in it for individual enterprise, but all in subordination to the powers that be and are ordained by its Sovereign Head for the due administration of the kingdom.

The danger of forgetting that the Church is a Kingdom.

Now, in the spread and development of the Church both abroad and at home, this essential feature of its being can only be ignored with harm and loss. In foreign missions some thoughtful men have discovered herein one of the most fruitful causes of failure. This was set forth in a remarkable manner by a distinguished Indian Bishop about a quarter of a century ago, at an epoch when

the whole work of our Missionary agents seemed to be paralysed. The Bishop of Bombay wrote a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury which stirred the Anglican Church to its very heart, and led eventually to the institution of an annual Day of Intercession. The burden of his complaint was simply this, that we had not acted on "the clear conviction that our work, regarded as to its form and specific nature, is the foundation of the kingdom of Christ." "I must not shrink," he says, "from recording my opinion, as an observer of Protestant Missions in India, and of our own particular share in these Missions, that the Catholic spirit of our Book of Common Prayer has not exerted its legitimate influence, and that our work has been too much an appendage to an imposing but unreal Spiritualism. Protestant Missions, as a whole, have been an attempt to infuse into the mind of India a somewhat abstract, logical, and hard thing, most commonly described here as Christianity, and which modern Calvinism likes to call 'the Gospel.' And we of the Church have not definitely endeavoured to bring home to the heart of India that Person, Whom it would welcome as its King, and that Society of flesh and blood, which even Caste would submit to, as His human yet Divine kingdom.

"Most assuredly, if our notions of truth are to be gathered from Holy Scripture, rather than from the brief traditions of a School, the whole Word of God teaches us that the Son of God came to be 'the King of all the earth,' and that the Gospel which He and His Apostles preached is 'the Gospel of the kingdom.'"[1]

In no part of the Bible is this teaching more forcibly inculcated than in the pages of S. Matthew's Gospel.

So again in the Church at home. It has been one of the chief glories and blessings of what is called "the Catholic Revival," that it has restored the wellnigh forgotten conception of the Church as the kingdom of Christ, and has engrafted upon the Evangelical requirement of individual holiness a due recognition of the corporate life of Christ's Body. As citizens of a kingdom, Churchmen have common duties and imperial interests; and foremost among these is the homage which their King claims from His Presence among them.

There is no longer any Shechinah to mark its visible dwelling-place, but the Church, like the

[1] "Indian Missions. A letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury by Henry Alexander Douglas, D.D., Bishop of Bombay." Published by Rivingtons, 1872.

Temple, is not for man but for the King,[1] and must therefore be "exceeding magnifical," as befitting the Divine Presence. The worship, too, which we offer has all the environment of material splendour, all "the beauty of holiness," which Music and Art can contribute, the pomp and circumstance of a magnificent ritual, not as though it were possessed of any inherent value, but as emblematic of that which is spiritual, the best earthly expression of what is the peculiar prerogative of the kingdom of Christ, "the kingdom of heaven."

[1] "The Palace is not for man but for God": 1 Chron. xxix. It is because S. Matthew dwells so much on the idea of the Church being a Kingdom and its Head a King, that this chapter, in which David speaks of what the King's Palace ought to be in splendour and dignity, is appointed to be read on the Evangelist's Feast.

S. Mark

πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν.

σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν.

σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου. καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα.

IX.

The Author of the Second Gospel.

The name of John surnamed Mark, or simply Mark, comes before us somewhat frequently in the New Testament. Attempts have been made to refer the notices to two different persons, but they cannot be regarded as very successful. There is no reason for separating them; and we accept the ancient tradition that in all cases it is one and the same person, bound by ties of no little interest both to S. Peter and S. Paul; for though, as we shall see, S. Peter left the most marked stamp of his personal influence upon S. Mark's Gospel, indications of the Pauline spirit are by no means wanting. S. Mark had something in common with both the Apostles, and we are not surprised to find him drawn almost equally to one and the other.

Grotius, Tillemont, Cotelier.

Only one person named Ma in the New Testament.

John was the designation by which the Evangelist was best known at first, but it was not long before his Latin name altogether superseded it, just as

Saul became completely merged in Paul after his conversion. S. Luke introduces him into Christian history under his Jewish title, "John, whose surname was Mark," in connection with S. Peter's deliverance from prison. This is the first indication of an acquaintance which became so close in later times, being witnessed to by the internal phenomena of the Gospel and corroborated by a striking consensus of Patristic writings. S. Mark's mother was a lady of means and influence, and her house was a rallying-point for the early Christians in days of danger and persecution. S. Peter turned to it instinctively when he found himself unexpectedly set free. He must have felt that nowhere else would the tidings of his escape be so cordially welcomed; and he was not disappointed, for he found "many gathered together praying," no doubt for his safety.

Acts xii. 12.

The beginning of his friendship with S. Peter.

The next notice associates him with S. Paul: "Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, when they had fulfilled their ministry, and took with them John, whose surname was Mark." The connection, however, was speedily broken; on their first missionary journey at Perga, for some unrecorded reason, "John departing from them returned to Jerusalem." It led to the memorable

xii. 25.

His companionship with S. Paul.

Acts xv. 39.

"sharp contention" and unpleasant quarrel between two Apostles which, while it has its value in witnessing to the fidelity and truthfulness of the sacred historian, has proved a stumbling-block to those who are satisfied with nothing short of perfection in the saints of God. Conjecture has been busy in discovering motives for S. Mark's withdrawal; most commonly it has been attributed to a failure of courage. The young "minister," whose duty it was to arrange for the comfort of the travellers, was afraid to face the perils of a journey through Phrygia and Pisidia. Either, it is said, he feared the robbers with which the mountain passes were infested, or else the danger of crossing the swollen rivers and torrents. In the absence of any definite information we prefer to give him credit for a better motive, and we may find one in the anticipation of a longer journey than he was prepared for, and a reluctance, prompted by a strong sense of filial duty, to leave his mother for any length of time unprotected in the danger to which she was exposed through persecution. It is in some such view as this that we find the best explanation both for the lenient view which S. Barnabas took of his vacillation, and for the after-change in S. Paul's feelings towards him.

S. Mark's desertion of S. Paul.

Having maintained this view very strongly,[1] I am glad to have it confirmed by the latest writer on this Gospel, an eminent Biblical scholar;[2] and I quote what he says, as it goes far to save S. Mark's memory from the accusation of simple fear and cowardice, often and so freely brought against him. "He was not sent to the work by the Spirit or by the Church, as Barnabas and Saul had been. The sphere of the mission, moreover, had not been revealed at the first; and when the Apostles determined to leave the sea-coast and strike across the Taurus into the interior, he may have considered himself free to abandon the undertaking. He had left Jerusalem for Antioch, and had not engaged himself to face the dangers of a campaign in central Asia Minor: and he may have felt that duty to his mother and his home required him to break off at this point from so perilous a development of the mission."

S. Mark was a kinsman of Barnabas; according to the Authorised Version "sister's son,"[3] *i.e.* nephew, but this is based upon a late usage of the

[1] Cf. *Footprints of the Apostles*, ii. 63, 64.

[2] Professor Swete, Reg. Prof. of Divinity at Cambridge.

[3] ἀνέψιος, in Class. Greek a cousin-german; so also in Hellenistic Greek; LXX. Numb. xxxvi. 11.

Greek word, and of Luther's translation;[1] the invariable meaning in ancient times was "cousin." In either case, whether Mary were the aunt or sister of Barnabas, we can easily understand that sympathy in the separation from her son might lead him to vindicate S. Mark from the unworthy motives with which he was charged. It is at least the most natural explanation of his conduct.

S. Paul's reconciliation with the Evangelist.

Possibly also, if we may not say probably, S. Paul was turned in his favour through the same reconsideration. There are indications that he felt that he had misjudged him, and was anxious to make reparation for a past injustice. If he had not wished the Colossians to know this, it is difficult to see why he should remind them that Mark was related to Barnabas. The mere mention of the name of Barnabas in connection with him would be certain to recall the quarrel; and he wished them to realise that he had misunderstood the young man's motives for deserting him. He would remove any unfavourable impression, which they might have received twelve years before, and he bespoke for him a hearty welcome; "if he come unto you, receive him." We learn from other passages that S. Mark was fully reinstated in the

Col. iv. 10.

[1] Neffe. The earliest ancient versions render it rightly, cousin.

Apostle's confidence, for he was with him beguiling the tedium and mitigating the hardships of his first imprisonment; and again in his second imprisonment, when all his companions except S. Luke had left him, he asks Timothy to bring Mark to him, and was careful to speak of him as useful to him
2 Tim. iv. 11. for the ministry, that is, in the same capacity[1] that he had previously declined his services.

The influence of S. Paul in favour of the Gentiles.

There can be no question that S. Mark was much in the company of S. Paul, and most probably it was through his influence that he became so interested in the Gentiles, as to write his Gospel primarily for them.[2] Like S. Matthew he was by birth a Jew, but unlike him he did not think first of his own fellow-countrymen. There are many indications of this; he explains Jewish rites and
ii. 18. usages: he told his readers that "the disciples of John and of the Pharisees used to fast"; that "the Pharisees and all the Jews" did not eat "except
vii. 1-4. they wash their hands oft, holding the tradition of the elders"; in his account of the cursing of the fig-tree, he added for the sake of those who did not

[1] It is true in Acts xiii. 5 it is *ὑπηρέτης* and in 2 Tim. iv. 11 *διακονία*, but in both cases it is "service," though not precisely similar. For an examination of the former term, see Swete, *S. Mark*, p. xii.

[2] S. Luke had done the same, but he was himself a Gentile.

know when figs ripened in Judæa, that "the time of figs was not yet." Again, none but Gentiles required to be told that they killed the Paschal Lamb on the first day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread, or that "the preparation" was "the day before the Sabbath." The significance of all this becomes obvious when the parallel passages in S. Matthew's Gospel are examined.[1] xi. 13.

This was one of the consequences of the Evangelist's intercourse and friendship with "the Apostle of the Gentiles"; but he was influenced also and to a larger extent, as we shall see hereafter, by another Apostle, S. Peter.

S. Peter's relationship to S. Mark.

We saw at the beginning of his history that S. Peter was on very intimate terms with his mother Mary, and it is only natural to conclude that the son of a house which he constantly visited would be brought into close relations with him. Once S. Peter calls him "my son"; the exact sense in which he used the term may be ambiguous, but at least it is one of endearment. The Apostle may have used it in a purely spiritual sense as the father who had begotten him in the Faith, or else

[1] These illustrations might be largely multiplied, *e.g.*, Jewish localities are explained: cf. also S. Mark vi. 7-12 with S. Matt. x. 5, 6. We have, however, quoted enough to support our statement.

to indicate that in love and affection Mark was to him as one of his own children. We are inclined to accept this latter interpretation on two grounds. First, because elsewhere in the New Testament spiritual sonship is expressed by another word, one more correctly rendered by the Revisers "child."[1] S. Paul invariably designates Timothy as his "child"; "my true child in faith"; "my child, Timothy"; "my beloved child"; so also Titus is his "true child after a common faith," and in all these cases he speaks as their "spiritual father." It points to the conclusion that Mark did not owe his conversion to the Apostle, though it is highly probable that he was a pupil, who in early days had "sat at his feet to be catechised and taught the way of the Lord," and during his discipleship "had come to look upon his mother's old friend and teacher as a second father, and to render to him the offices of filial piety."

1 Tim. i. 2, 18.
2 Tim. i. 2.
Tit. i. 4.

Secondly, because there is a strong presumption that he was won to Christianity by circumstances in no way associated with S. Peter. S. Mark records an episode which is wholly inexplicable, except on the supposition that he was personally

The young man, who escaped from being captured on the night of the arrest.

[1] S. Peter writes *υἱός μου*, but S. Paul always *τέκνον*. S. John used the diminutive of the latter *τέκνια* for his converts.

concerned in it. After the arrest of Jesus in Gethsemane, he says, "there followed Him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body; and the young men laid hold on him: and he left the linen cloth and fled from them naked." Now there is absolutely no historical evidence as to the identity of the person of whom this is related; but it seems that there is only one man whose connection with it can possibly justify the introduction of an incident, apparently so irrelevant, in the midst of a narrative of the very gravest circumstance, that is, S. Mark himself.

xiv. 51, 52.

Greswell's Dissertations, i. 99.

He must have witnessed it, at all events, for we cannot understand from whom he could possibly have derived the information, as it is expressly stated that, when it occurred, all Christ's disciples had forsaken Him and fled. No one remained but Judas and the armed multitude. On the supposition that S. Mark was the young man, and that he had narrowly escaped being captured, it was certain to make a lasting impression upon his memory. If we go further, and conclude that it was the turning-point in his spiritual life, that what he witnessed of our Lord's conduct in the midst of His foes convinced him of the righteousness of His cause and led to his own conversion subsequently, it accounts

for his anxiety to preserve the history, while for obvious reasons he concealed the name. In the absence of any other clue to explain the insertion of the story, such a conjecture is quite justified, especially as its acceptance creates so much more interest in the narrative.[1]

Traditional information about S. Mark.

Tradition associates S. Mark with S. Peter in immediate connection with the writing of the Gospel. Eusebius states on the authority of an early writer,[2] that S. Peter's hearers at Rome[3] were so impressed by his preaching that they constrained S. Mark, who was his companion there, to leave them in writing a monument of the doctrine which he had preached, and that he yielded and gave them the history which bears his name. His companionship at Rome is based on a figurative

Euseb. Eccl. Hist. ii. 15; vi. 14.

[1] Other conjectures have named Lazarus, S. John, and James the Lord's brother, as the young man, *e.g.*, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Epiphanius; but S. John was an Apostle and had fled with the rest. Many later commentators accept the belief that he was S. Mark—Lange, Olshausen, Thomson, etc.

[2] Clem. *Instit.* Book vi.

[3] There are few questions upon which opinions are more divided. For the literal interpretation of Babylon, we have the fact that it is most natural, as there is no reason for an allegorical reference in a plain narrative of facts. The early Church, however, so interpreted it. Babylon itself was at this time deserted (Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 9). It is said that the reference to Rome was denied by Protestants to dissociate S. Peter from Rome. Two eminent divines, however, have contended for Rome, viz., Lightfoot, *in Clem.* ii. 492, and Salmon, *Introd.* pp. 462-63.

interpretation of "Babylon" in S. Peter's First Epistle, from which place the writer sends the salutation of his son, Mark. v. 13.

There is a yet further tradition that the same Apostle sent him on a mission to Egypt, where he founded the Church at Alexandria and became its first Bishop. There, it is said, the rage of the heathen was kindled against him, and on the Feast of their god, Serapis, they seized, maltreated, and finally put him to a most cruel death. His sepulchre in the city was visited for centuries as a favourite place of pilgrimage, till in 815 A.D. some Venetian merchants carried off his remains, and conveyed them to Venice, where the splendid Cathedral, always associated with the Evangelist's name, was built to receive them. From this time S. Mark became the patron saint of the city, and the Lion, so erroneously assigned to him by Christian art, was adopted by the Venetian Senate as their armorial ensign.

His connection with Venice.

The consequences of his friendship with S. Peter will be fully considered in the following pages.

X.

The Graphic Style of the Author.

The vivid and picturesque style of description throughout this Gospel points to the influence, if not the actual authorship, of an eye-witness. There are no other pages in Holy Scripture which put the scenes before the reader with so much pictorial detail. A few examples will serve to illustrate this marked characteristic.

ii. 1, 2. At the beginning of the history, when the report spread that Jesus was in S. Peter's house in Capernaum, the Author not only tells us that the people gathered together in numbers, but he enables us to picture the crowd and their eagerness to find their way into His Presence. The inner court was so thronged that the multitude reached out into the street; not even the parts about the door could hold them.[1] In the midst of the crowd we

Signs of the influence of an eye-witness.

[1] χωρεῖν, to hold, or contain. Cf. S. John xxi. 25, "even the world itself could not contain (χωρῆσαι) the books that should be written."

see a group of persons—even the number was noticed—pushing their way up to the entrance with a man "sick of the palsy,[1] borne of four": but they could go no further; so discovering from the direction of the upturned faces that Jesus was addressing the people from an upper story, they went back into the street and ascended a public staircase leading to the roof of the house, and, uncovering the verandah just below them, let down the litter at the very feet of Jesus.[2] Then the miracle of healing was wrought. The man sick of the palsy.

Again, after our Lord had been teaching the people by parables and wished to pass over to the other side of the lake for rest and retirement, who but an eye-witness could have given with such a graphic touch the idea of His utter weariness; "they took Him even as He was[3] in the ship"? We fancy we can see them almost lifting Him in. The whole description of the journey across is conceived in the same style: "other little ships" went with them; and the Master fell fast The voyage across the Lake. iv. 36.

[1] παραλυτικός, *i.e.* with a tendency to paralysis. For S. Luke's more accurate description, cf. p. 126.

[2] Cf. *Footprints*, ch. ix., where the scene is described in detail.

[3] ὡς ἦν, *i.e.* without any preparation: they saw that He was thoroughly wearied, and got Him into the boat as soon as they could.

asleep; the disciples had made Him the best resting-place they could in the stern, with His head on the boatswain's cushion. A storm arose, but they would not disturb Him; we enter into their reluctance, which was all so natural knowing how tired He was; but at last, when they saw the waves filling the ship,[1] they were compelled by positive fear for their safety to awake Him. Then take the description of the Feeding of the five thousand; the writer must either have been an eye-witness or heard it from one who was. Jesus "commanded them to make all sit down by companies upon the green grass. And they sat down in ranks by hundreds and by fifties." The word translated "ranks" is of doubtful etymology. As generally interpreted it is a "bed of herbs or flowers"[2]; and nothing could more vividly express their orderly arrangement for the convenience of ministering to them, and the picturesqueness of their appearance in their bright Eastern

The Miracle of the Five loaves.

vi. 39, 40.

[1] γεμίζεσθαι—not as A. V. "was now full." If so, it would have sunk. It is the present tense, was in the act of filling.

[2] It is not unlikely that πρασιαί is a foreign word, with the same root-letters as Pharisee, implying separation, "detachments." Strictly speaking, πράσον is a leek, and there is nothing bright in a bed of leeks, but it is strongly maintained by certain writers that it is also a flower-bed. In either case the description comes from a spectator.

costumes on the brilliant green[1] of the early spring.

An instance of the writer's exactness is found in the account of the mission of two disciples to fetch a colt for our Lord to ride upon in His entry into Jerusalem: "They found the colt tied by the door without in a place where two ways met." This translation is taken from the "cross road" of the Vulgate; more probably it is at "the road leading round to the back of the house."[2] Whichever we accept, it witnesses equally to the personal observation of the informant.

The search for the colt by the two disciples.

S. Mark describes the scene in which the rich and poor cast their offerings into the Treasury with the pen of an eye-witness. After Jesus had done teaching in the Court of the Gentiles He passed into that of the Women and sat down to rest in front of the Treasury, the thirteen trumpet-shaped chests, into which the different offerings were put. The rich He saw casting in not only much, but many xii. 41.

The Treasury in the Temple.

[1] This was after the "early rain" which followed the Passover. This notice is not peculiar to S. Mark, though he only speaks of the grass being "green." S. Matthew says they sat down "on the grass." S. John notices that "there was much grass in the place."

[2] *ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου*: Lidd. and Sc. translate it a road that leads round a place or block of buildings. The Vulg. bivium derived it not from *ἀμφὶ* but from *ἄμφω*.

coins,[1] for so it is in the original. It marked their ostentation, and the eye-witness who was with our Lord remembered His calling attention to it. There is another somewhat similar case where S. Mark's informant shows the same minuteness of detail; as he mentioned before that Jesus "sat over against the Treasury," so here, He sat upon the Mount of Olives "over against the Temple." This was in full view of the building whose doom He pronounced. Further, he alone records the interesting circumstance that S. Andrew was admitted for the first time to the inner circle of our Lord's disciples, when they spoke to Him privately about the destruction of Jerusalem. He must have been an immediate follower of Jesus; but he had not seen such a thing before, and was careful to record it.

xiii. 2, 3.

The inner circle of disciples enlarged.

The Storm on the Lake.

It marks the presence of a spectator that in the narrative of the Storm on the Lake the very words in which it was stilled are preserved. S. Luke merely says that "He arose and rebuked the raging of the wind"; but S. Mark repeats His utterance of command. His words were not merely, as the Authorised Version renders them, "Peace, be still," in which there would have been nothing especial to

[1] ἔβαλλον πολλά, *i.e.* κέρματα. If it merely meant much, it would naturally have been πολύ.

arrest the attention of a spectator, but "be silent and be gagged" or "muzzled."[1] He spoke as though the storm had been raised by some monster of the deep whose roar must be repressed by force. We can well understand how such an expression would fix itself upon the memory of one who heard it. Again S. Mark, unlike the other Evangelists, has preserved the actual language, not merely its Greek equivalent, but the Aramaic itself: Boanerges, Talitha Kumi, Korban, Ephphatha, Rabboni, Abba. iv. 39.

We find another mark of the informant's presence in the familiar habit of noticing the transition of one scene to another by the expression "and immediately," which by itself or one of its synonyms, "forthwith," "presently," "by and by," "straightway," and "anon,"[2] occurs over forty times in the Gospel.

Two miracles, described by S. Mark alone, corroborate the view that he owed his accurate information to a follower of our Lord; they are the cure of "the deaf man with stammering tongue," vii. 31-35. and the restoration of "the blind man at Bethsaida." viii. 22-26. In both cases the whole scene is vividly set

[1] *σιώπα, πεφίμωσο.* Elsewhere He addresses a demon: *φιμώθητι*, i. 25.

[2] Only one word is used in Greek, *εὐθέως*.

before us; in both, the touching incident is noticed of His taking the man apart from the crowd, once actually leading him by the hand. The whole process of the cure of the deaf and dumb[1] man is recorded: He "put His fingers into his ears, and He spit, and touched his tongue"—even the Lord's upward look to heaven, and His sigh or groan of sympathy; it could only have come from the lips of one who had seen the action and heard the sound.

The cure of the deaf and dumb man.

It is the same with the blind man; nothing could be more realistic; the gradual building up of the patient's faith to be healed; the first glimpse of returning sight; his longing to see his fellow-creatures, and the first impression of their forms magnified and distorted; the second touch of the Divine Hand, followed by the clearing away of all the mist and film, and his perfect restoration. "He took the blind man by the hand and led him out of the town; and when He had spit on his eyes, and put His hands upon him, He asked him if he saw ought; and he looked up, and said, I see men as trees, walking. After that He put His hands again upon his eyes and made him look up; and he was restored, and saw every man clearly."

The blind man at Bethsaida.

[1] μογίλαλος is used in LXX. Isaiah xxxv. 6, "the tongue of the dumb," but according to its etymology, it means one who stammers or speaks with difficulty.

In addition to all this evidence there is the oft-recurring reference to the lights and shadows that passed over the Face of Jesus in joy and sorrow, satisfaction and disappointment, indignation and anger; but all these will receive a fuller notice when we come to consider the special phase of his Lord's Person, which S. Mark undertook to portray.

Only one conclusion can be drawn from the above illustrations. It is, that the Evangelist owed the graphic colouring and picturesque details of his history to one who was in daily attendance upon Jesus Christ, and saw with his own eyes the mighty works which He did.

XI.

S. Peter's Influence upon the Author.

THERE is a strong presumption from what we have written, that the eye-witness who helped S. Mark in his narrative was an Apostle; the consideration of further details goes far to confirm it.

Evidence to be drawn from the use of the title Apostle in the Gospel.

The title of Apostle was bestowed upon the Twelve, and only extended to a few others, such as S. Paul and S. Barnabas,[1] and was naturally regarded as a mark of high distinction. It is in perfect consistency with their modesty and self-suppression that they should refrain from claiming it themselves, except where occasion required it. S. Paul uses it when it became necessary to vindicate his Gal. i. 1. Divine commission to the Galatians; "Paul, an

[1] From Rom. xvi. 7 it would seem that Andronicus and Junia were so called. There are other indications of an extended use, in Phil. ii. 25 and 2 Cor. viii. 23, but in a lower sense, as a messenger of the Gospel. The Hebrew שָׁלִיחַ, an apostle for "one who was sent," or had a mission, was a very common title. There is an interesting discussion on the use of the term in Lightfoot's *Galatians*, 89-97.

Apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ"; and to the Corinthians he shows that he had the primary qualification for the title, though he had waived the claim: "Am I not an Apostle? Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?" In the Gospel History, where the reader's attention is concentrated upon Jesus Christ, and everything is based upon His authority, the Apostles were careful to speak of themselves in connection with Him not by their title of highest honour, but as members of the wider circle of "disciples." S. Matthew in his Gospel only once appropriates the high distinction, and then of necessity; it is when he is recording for all future ages who constituted the Apostolate: "Now the names of the twelve Apostles are these." S. John also uses the title but once, and then not in its technical sense: "The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent (in the Greek, an apostle) greater than he that sent him."[1]

1 Cor. ix. 1.

x. 2.

xiii. 16.

When we turn to S. Luke's Gospel the usage of the term is frequent. It reflected no distinction or glory upon himself; there was no reason, therefore, for him to abstain from using it, and so the

[1] The A. V. rather implies that the noun and the verb correspond; but in the latter case it is *τοῦ πέμψαντος*, not, as we should expect, *ἀποστείλαντος*.

Apostles are designated again and again by their rightful title.[1]

We should have expected S. Mark to have followed the same rule, for, like his brother Evangelist, he was outside the Apostolic order; but herein the second Gospel resembles not the third, but the first and the last. There is only one explanation; and it is found in the belief that it was due to the influence of one who was himself an Apostle.

We shall find on examination that the Apostle must have been S. Peter.

The bearing of S. Peter's connection with certain events and scenes on the question.

First, we observe that he is associated by name in this Gospel with certain events, while in the parallel histories he is in no way noted; and the evidence becomes more cogent when the circumstances are found to be unimportant. S. Peter, in his reports to S. Mark, had incidentally mentioned his own connection with them, and as the Evangelist was sure to cherish the remembrance of whatever interested his friend and companion, it finds a place in his Gospel.

These are some of the events which are associated with S. Peter. After the miracles which Jesus wrought in Capernaum at the beginning of His

[1] Six times in the Gospel and about thirty in his Second Treatise, the Acts of the Apostles.

ministry, He went forth to preach in the synagogue of Galilee, "and," we read, "Simon and they that i. 36.
were with him followed after Him." The original language helps us to understand why Simon should mention his own name: it is "pursued after Him." [1] When Simon rose in the morning he was disappointed to find that His Master was missing; He had gone out "a great while before day." Peter, true to his impetuous character, went out at once in eager pursuit. We can imagine how he would tell S. Mark: "I lost no time, but hurried out to search for Him, and the other inmates of the house joined in the search."

Again, the day after Jesus had cursed the fig-tree, as they were passing the spot in the morning, "Peter calling to remembrance saith unto Him, Master, behold, the fig-tree which Thou cursedst is xi. 21.
withered away." If the information had been given by some one else, it would have been unnatural to speak of another as calling it to remembrance; but nothing was more natural, if he was speaking of himself, than to say, "then I suddenly remembered how the tree had been cursed."

It was also a personal reminiscence which led

[1] *καὶ κατεδίωξαν αὐτόν*: in the oldest MSS. it is in the sing. number, emphasising the part taken by Simon.

to the insertion of his name in this Gospel as one
xiii. 3. of those who sat with our Lord on the Mount of Olives, and asked Him the question which drew forth one of His greatest predictions.

There is another case where the mention of S. Peter's name is fraught with important consequences. When the devout women entered the sepulchre at the rising of the sun, "they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment"; and he saith unto them, "Go your way,
xvi. 5, 7. tell His disciples and Peter that He goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see Him, as He said unto you." S. Matthew merely mentions the
xxviii. 7. former of these, "go quickly and tell His disciples"; he had no particular interest in the fact that an individual had been named by the angel, but S. Peter had. To him it was a matter of vital moment; crushed as he was, and in utter despondency at the recollection of his sin, such a personal message would come "with healing in its wings"; for it gave him the assurance of His Master's forgiveness and the restitution of his forfeited office. What a touch of human nature it is that he should wish the world to know that his repentance had been accepted and the Divine favour restored!

There are, moreover, cases where S. Mark sup-

presses his name in matters of importance, or omits to speak of him and his actions, while other Evangelists record them as redounding to his credit. For instance, he describes the house at Capernaum, which our Lord made His home, as "the house of Simon and Andrew," but S. Matthew and S. Luke name S. Peter as the sole owner. It was an honour, however, which he would not appropriate to himself, and he could not refer to it without allowing his brother to share the enviable prerogative.

Inferences to be drawn from the suppression of S. Peter's name, when the other Gospels give it.

Two of the Evangelists place S. Peter at the head of the Apostolic Lists, and S. Matthew notices his precedence, "the first Simon, who is called Peter"; but in S. Mark's Gospel attention is diverted from this; "and He ordained twelve . . . and Simon He surnamed Peter."

x. 2.

iii. 14, 16.

S. Matthew records the great venture of faith, when in the storm Peter, at the bidding of His Lord, trusted himself to the treacherous sea and walked upon the waves; but the act finds no place in S. Mark's history. It was, doubtless, suppressed because he felt that its heroism would completely overshadow his subsequent failure.

xiv. 29.

Again, his courage at the final Arrest, when the armed band closed around our Lord, and he drew

his sword and attacked the High Priest's attendant, is passed by unnoticed, for there is nothing in this Gospel to identify the assailant, whereas S. John is careful to give us his name: "Then Simon Peter, having a sword, drew it."

xviii. 10.

Yet further, S. Mark says nothing of the fact that he was one of two chosen messengers sent by Jesus to make preparation for His Last Passover; nor again of the special personal interest that our Lord took in him when Satan was subjecting all the Apostles to the severest trial; "I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not."[1]

S. Luke xxii. 8.

S. Luke xxii. 32.

There is, however, one passage which carries the clearest conviction to our mind, that none but S. Peter could possibly have guided S. Mark in the version which he has given of it. It is that which records S. Peter's great confession, and our Lord's immediate disclosure of the sufferings and death that awaited Him. Both S. Matthew and S. Mark record the answer which S. Peter made to our Lord's question, "Whom say ye that I am?" And Simon Peter answered and said, "Thou art the

S. Matt. xvi. 13, 16. S. Mark viii. 27.

[1] It becomes more significant if you look at the whole sentence, *ἰδοὺ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς . . . ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδεήθην περὶ σοῦ*: "Satan hath desired to have you" (*ὑμᾶς*, *i.e.* the whole company of the Apostles), "but I have prayed for thee" (*σοῦ*), *i.e.* as an individual.

Christ." Both also connect with the confession our Lord's first clear information of what was coming; but there is a striking difference between the two: for while S. Matthew records the splendid eulogium, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," which followed the confession, and also the severe rebuke to the same Apostle, "Get thee behind Me, Satan: thou art an offence unto Me," which his remonstrance, "Be it far from Thee, Lord: this shall not be unto Thee," drew forth, S. Mark suppresses all mention of the former, whilst he preserves the full account of the latter. Had he been left to act independently, it is almost impossible, when we recall what his relationship was to the Apostle as "a son," that he could ever have allowed such a noble benediction to be passed over in silence. None but he, to whose credit it so greatly redounded, could have secured the suppression.

S. Matt. xvi. 18, 23.

Two more illustrations and we have done. It cannot be accidental that S. Mark alone speaks of two cock-crowings; the fact that S. Peter was warned twice aggravated his guilt, and he wished it to be known. He too has preserved another significant detail in connection with the denial;

S. John says that while S. Peter was standing in the courtyard "he warmed himself." S. Mark adds that he warmed himself "at the fire," or rather "with his face to the light." The circumstance had remained fixed in the Apostle's memory, for it is more than probable that it was a sudden blaze in the brazier which lit up his features and led to his detection.[1]

xiv. 15.

Patristic evidence on the relationship of S. Peter to the Evangelist.

These illustrations, which might be easily multiplied, establish by internal evidence S. Peter's close connection with the writer of the Gospel. It is amply corroborated by the external witness of Fathers in the early ages. Papias, who appealed to the authority of John, the Presbyter, a disciple of Jesus Christ, says that "Mark, being Peter's interpreter, wrote with accuracy all that he remembered." Irenæus describes him as a "disciple and interpreter of Peter," and says that after he and Paul had departed this life "he handed down to us that which Peter preached." Eusebius has also preserved a tradition that those who had heard Peter's preaching at Rome used their endeavours to induce Mark, his companion, to embody his

Euseb. Ecc. Hist. iii. 39.

id. v. 8.

id. ii. 15.

[1] In *Footprints of the Son of Man*, ch. 1, *note*, I have explained why S. Luke was also able to record the same detail, viz., that it was probably told him by S. Mark when they were together at Colossæ.

doctrine in writing, and that having done so, he obtained the Apostles' *imprimatur* for its use in the Churches. Tertullian says that "the Gospel which Mark put out is attributed to Peter, whose interpreter he was." Lastly, S. Jerome writes that this "Gospel was composed at the dictation of Peter, Mark being his amanuensis." In the light of such testimony we are not surprised that very various estimates were formed of S. Peter's share in composing the Gospel. The natural desire of the early Christians to enhance its value by direct Apostolic authority encouraged the tradition that it was actually dictated by him. Christian Art[1] contributed largely to the same belief by representing S. Mark as the Apostle's scribe or secretary, kneeling before him and writing from his dictation, while the Apostle is seated. Sometimes they are painted together, S. Peter holding a book, S. Mark a pen; sometimes S. Peter is preaching to the Romans, while the Evangelist writes down what he says. It seems, in our judgment, to give a very exaggerated view of the Petrine influence, certainly not justified by the phenomena of the Gospel itself.

Contr. Marc. iv. 5.

ad Hædib. quæst. ii.

Evidence of Christian Art.

[1] Angelico da Fiesole in the Gallery of Florence, Bellini in the Academy of Venice, Bonvicino in the Brera, at Milan.

It is one thing to interpret a man's mind or to give expression to the general purport of his preaching; but it is quite another to write down at his dictation the words which fell from his lips. Such subordination on the part of S. Mark is nowhere to be traced in any part of his Gospel. The only sacrifice of individuality in his authorship is that which is found where two men, of whom one is the stronger character, have lived together in close relationship, and the weaker of the two commits to writing the record of their common converse. We have seen how S. Peter has indirectly stamped his personality on the history. He enjoyed the privilege, denied to S. Mark, of being from the beginning an eye-witness and minister of the word; and he imparted to him many details of stirring interest, as he recalled and talked over the scenes in which he had lived and moved; and they were reproduced by the author with all the vivid reality of the original narrative. S. Mark was largely helped indirectly in gathering the materials for his Gospel, but the actual composition was entirely his own.

XII.

The Humanity of Jesus Christ.

THE main purpose of S. Mark was to emphasise the Humanity of Jesus Christ, and that on its purely personal side: not like S. Matthew and S. Luke representing Him officially, the former as King, the latter as Priest. The absence of any genealogy of our Lord at the opening of this Gospel points very clearly to the distinction; there is no tracing of His Regal claims through a line of kings to David, the king: none, to mark His High-priesthood of the world and universal redemption, to Adam, the father of the race. S. Mark wished to paint Him in an unofficial capacity, as "a Man among men," never, however, leaving His Divinity without witness, but even, as we shall see hereafter, with supreme wisdom establishing it as a recognised fact of paramount importance on the very frontispiece of his history: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God."

Personal Memoirs of the Man, Jesus Christ

Throughout S. Mark's pages we see Him, as a

Man engaged in active service, but doing Divine things as well as human. This was inevitable; the inseparable union of the two natures made it impossible, even had he wished it, to portray His manhood and ignore His Deity. But if we compare S. John's descriptions of His Person with S. Mark's, we realise at once the difference; in the one, the Divine Nature is pressed into the foreground with all the force of convincing argument; in the other it is assumed, but only indirectly noticed.

The omission of all notice of Christ's birth, parentage, and infancy is somewhat surprising under the circumstances. Had these been described, as they have been by S. Matthew and S. Luke, we should have had a perfect portrait of the Perfect Man; but the Holy Spirit guided the Evangelist to pass them over for reasons of which we know nothing. Nevertheless, seeing at the same time that he has delineated so many human characteristics and features, and with so much more fulness of detail than we find elsewhere, we are quite justified in regarding the enforcement of Christ's manhood as the distinctive mark of the second Gospel. S. Mark invites attention to His look, His expressions of anger and indignation, His

Frequent notice of Human characteristics.

love and tenderness, His sympathy and sighs, His grief and sorrow, His wonder and amazement, His wants and weakness, everything, in short, which betokens His humanity.

Let us take a few illustrations: "He looked round about on them which sat about Him and said, Behold my mother and my brethren." iii. 34. Again the meaning of his look is expressed: in the synagogue before healing the man with his hand withered, "He looked round about on them with anger." iii. 5. When He felt that virtue had gone out of Him, "He looked round about to see her that had done this thing." v. 32. Twice whilst He was talking to His disciples on the danger of riches it is said that He "looked" upon them. x. 23, 27. So when He went into the Temple at his final visit, "He looked round about upon all things." xi. 11. There is something intensely human in this last look, knowing as He must have done that He would see it no more.

Then notice His expressions of grief: even in the exercise of Divine power, he lets it be seen: before healing the deaf and dumb man, looking up to heaven He sighed; and when the Pharisees tempted Him, "He sighed deeply in His spirit." vii. 34. viii. 12. So with the manifestation of His human love:

it was drawn out by something which He discerned in the rich young ruler's character; "and
x. 21. Jesus beholding him loved him"; it is even more striking if, as is quite possible, after the manner of the Rabbis with their pupils, He kissed him in token of His approbation, yearning to win him completely to His service.

When His disciples had been wrangling about their precedence in the Messianic kingdom, he rebuked them by putting forward a little child as a model to teach them humility; and He suffered
ix. 36. His human affections to break out, when He caught it up in His arms in a loving embrace. Again, when the people "brought young children to Him that He should touch them," and His disciples tried to keep them back, He was so displeased that He put them to open shame by doing as He had done
x. 14, 16. before: "He took them up in His arms,"[1] giving even more than was asked, and "put His hands upon them and blessed them." His heart overflowed with tenderness, and He made no attempt to

[1] This passage was substituted for S. Matt. xix. 13-15, as the Gospel in the Baptismal office in 1549, by a happy change, for it is far more expressive of our Lord's welcome to little children than that which had been used in the Sarum office and is still used in the modern Roman, in which there is no notice of their being taken up in His arms.

check the impulse of His human instincts. Is it not a strong confirmation of S. Mark's purpose to emphasise the human side of our Lord's Person, that he should twice have noticed this touching incident, though his brother Evangelists in recording the same events passed it over in silence? Again, He experienced feelings of surprise and wonder: when He found himself treated like "a prophet in his own country without honour," "He marvelled because of their unbelief."

S. Matt. xviii. 2; xix. 15. S. Luke xviii. 15.

vi. 6.

He showed Himself sensible of the common infirmities of humanity, hunger, weariness, fatigue, and faintness. He appeared relieved when He caught sight of a fig-tree afar off and hastened to it, looking for fruit; it is one of the most human of His acts and feelings. Twice we are told how He was obliged to restrain His hunger, because of the exacting demands of the multitude upon His time; "they could not so much as eat bread"; "they had no leisure so much as to eat."

iii. 20. vi. 31.

What a picture it gives us of tired humanity, when we are told that on the Way of the Cross, as they led Him out to be crucified, even after having pressed Simon the Cyrenian into the service, they were compelled almost to carry Him: "and they bring Him unto the place Golgotha"! The original

xv. 22.

word[1] suggests that He was so worn out with all that He had gone through, that at last they actually put their arms beneath and assisted Him to the place of execution.

Signs of His humanity in two of His miracles.

There are two miracles of healing which must have had a special attraction for S. Mark, for they are recorded by him alone, and they bear distinctly upon the fact that we are illustrating. They are the same that we dwelt upon as witnessing to the graphic descriptions peculiar to the Gospel, viz., the cure of the deaf and dumb by the Sea of Galilee, and the restoration of sight to the blind man at Bethsaida. In both He "comes down to meet our weakness," and adopts a method of healing not uncommon with human doctors. In both, also, it is worthy of notice that He enjoins the strictest secrecy, to indicate "the withholding and restraining the greatness of His Divine Presence."

The limitations of his foreknowledge, a sign of His humanity.

All this is very significant, but an even more striking illustration yet remains; it is to be found in His acknowledgment of the limitations that were incidental to His human nature, imposed upon Him-

[1] *φέρουσιν αὐτὸν*, by itself it does not necessitate more than the A. V. implies, "they bring Him," but when read with verse 20, *ἐξάγουσιν αὐτόν*, the above interpretation seems quite natural.

self as the Son of Man in that sphere in which He is "inferior to the Father, as touching His manhood." When our Lord predicted the end of the world, He told His hearers that the Father had not revealed the time of the end to any one; according to S. Matthew's record, "of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but My Father only"; but S. Mark reminds us that He was careful to point out that He Himself was denied the revelation, "No man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son,[1] but the Father." Such a restriction is a property of the manhood of Jesus, and it forms a fitting conclusion to the argument that in the assignment of the evangelistic emblems S. Augustine was right in giving to S. Mark the figure of the man.

Isaac Williams, Study of the Gospels, 52. S. Matt. xxiv. 36.

xiii. 32.

Now in drawing out the humanity of Christ as expressed by S. Mark, it behoves us not to lose sight of the fact that the same Evangelist recognised the great correlative truth of His Divinity. It has been lost sight of, especially in these later days. Biographers of Jesus Christ have written beautifully

The necessity of expressing the correlative truth of His Divinity.

[1] οὐδὲ ὁ Υἱός, "not even the Son." The words were inserted in some MSS. in the parallel passage of S. Matt., but there is no sufficient authority for the insertion, and Athanasius alleged at the Council of Nicæa that they were peculiar to S. Mark.

of His manhood, so beautifully that their readers have been entranced by the picture, and confessed that they have found at last the human ideal. Two instances out of many will suffice for illustration: Renan's *Vie de Jésus* and Hughes's *Manliness of Christ*.[1] The latter ignores the Divine Nature, while the former, when confronted by a clear manifestation of it,[2] becomes confused in a hopeless chaos. Both depart widely from the principle laid down by the Evangelist, who guarded against the possibility of heresy by placing the Godhead both
i. 1. at the opening and the close of His Gospel; "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of
xvi. 19. God"; "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God."

Directly we realise what the Manhood of Christ carries with it of human sympathy and fellow-feeling, the necessity of enforcing the doctrine becomes evident. History shows what evil consequences

[1] I have been told that the Author believed in our Lord's Godhead, and that he ignored it only for the purpose which he had in hand. It is, however, a dangerous thing to do, whatever the motives.

[2] *e.g.* the raising of Lazarus, his method of explaining which involves the greatest inconsistency, for after having held up our Lord as a perfect model, he accuses Him of collusion with Lazarus.

followed in the reaction from Arianism in the early ages, when the Deity of Jesus Christ was allowed to overshadow His humanity in the teaching of the Church. The great fact that we have in Him One "Who can be touched with a feeling of our infirmities" was little pressed, and men were allowed to drift away from their ancient moorings in search of some one to take His place. Thus it was that the Blessed Virgin won the warm affections of mankind, and her worship came into existence; and there can be little question that the very prominent place which she has so long filled has been accorded to her because men craved for a human being, altogether above and beyond themselves, who could weep with them that weep and rejoice in their joys. Those who travel much on the Continent, especially in countries where there is little knowledge and learning, such for instance as Brittany, have often been struck by the teaching of the pulpit in connection with this; for preachers invite their congregations, without any reserve, to look for what they need of human affection and compassion in the Blessed Virgin. For all that comes from God and God only, they have pointed to Jesus Christ; but for what man can give, to His Virgin Mother. Such a course can only be

Christ on His Human side superseded by the Blessed Virgin.

followed with harm and loss to the Church, for the Holy Ghost inspired S. Mark to teach us that we have in the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity One, Who was not only Perfect God but also Perfect Man.

S. Luke

πρόσωπον μόσχου ἐξ ἀριστέρων.

σφάξουσι τὸν μόσχον ἔναντι Κυρίου καὶ προσοίσουσι
οἱ υἱοὶ Ἀαρὼν οἱ ἱερεῖς τὸ αἷμα.

Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν
μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν.

XIII.

Authorship of the Gospel according to S. Luke.

In the early Church S. Luke was thought to have shared with another the honour of having written the third Gospel. The Fathers were extremely jealous of admitting into the Canon of Scripture any book or writing which could not claim an Apostolic origin. It was to the Apostles that our Lord had promised the Holy Spirit to guide them into all truth, and they felt that there was no guarantee of Divine inspiration outside that sacred circle. Tertullian said that it was "a truth of primary importance that the works of the Evangelists should have Apostles for their authors." We have seen how this was illustrated in the universal tradition that S. Peter was the real author of the Gospel "according to S. Mark." Only less widely was it believed that S. Paul's teaching, if not his actual writing, might be read in the pages of the Gospel "according to S. Luke." Irenæus is responsible

Early evidence of S. Paul's influence on S. Luke.

adv. Hær. iii. 1 and 14.

for the first expression of this belief: "Luke, the companion of Paul, put down in a book the Gospel which he had preached"; and after him not a few of the Fathers assumed that, when the Apostle used the phrase "according to my gospel," he intended that which was written by S. Luke under his direction and guidance.

Rom. ii. 16; xvi. 25. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. iii. 4.

Hieron. de viris illus. c. 7.

It is true that S. Paul was not one of those to whom the promise of supernatural help was directly made; but he himself had given the assurance that he was not indebted to men for the substance of the Gospel which he preached, but that he had received it by an express revelation from Jesus Christ. Any inferiority to the rest of the Apostles, arising from the lateness of his call, which was subsequent to the promise of the guidance of the Holy Spirit, was fully made up by Divine interposition of another kind. There are internal phenomena of the Gospel, however, which are not consistent with the early tradition of Pauline authorship; indeed, it is practically disproved in the opening preface. Nothing can be plainer than S. Luke's claim to be an independent inquirer into our Lord's life and work. He is the historian and writer of the book; what he owed to S. Paul was not the help of joint composition and authorship,

Gal. i. 12. 1 Cor. xi. 23.

nor even guidance in the selection of his materials; his obligation was wholly unofficial, or, if we may so speak, accidental, and it lay in the fact that during a long friendship he had sensibly or insensibly imbibed his teaching and learned to think his thoughts, and even at times to use his language. If then the third Gospel bears the impress of the Pauline mind, as it certainly does, it was not by virtue of any such active and direct co-operation as the ancient tradition implied.

The effect of a long and close companionship.

The companionship of the two men was of a kind especially calculated to produce common aims and interests, as well as an harmonious conception of the way of salvation, which they both preached. In all probability it had begun at a most impressionable age, in College life; its ties had been cemented by foreign travel; it had been deepened by sympathy in extreme bodily suffering; and at last had been sanctified by the privilege of faithful service, when S. Luke was left the sole companion of the Apostle's closing life.

If the Evangelist was born, as Eusebius says, at Antioch, he must have been sent to the neighbouring University of Tarsus, where there was at the time one of the most famous Schools of Medicine,[1]

[1] There was only one other that had anything like the same reputation, viz., at Cos or Coos.

and there he may well have been a contemporary and friend of S. Paul.

If it be true that friendship is never more tried than by companionship abroad, that of these two men must have been subjected to the severest test both by sea and land, at Troas, Miletus, Tyre, Philippi, Cæsarea, Jerusalem, and Rome.

Again, there can hardly be a doubt that he earned the Apostle's most affectionate gratitude for the relief that he was able to afford him at those times when his "thorn in the flesh" so sorely tried him.[1] The terms in which S. Paul speaks of him—"the beloved physician"—illustrate the attachment which is so often found between a doctor and his patient.

Finally, we have positive proof that it remained unbroken to the end, for amidst the shock of universal desertion in the immediate prospect of martyrdom, the Apostle penned those memorable words, which

[1] Lightfoot in his *Com. on the Galatians* has established the physical character of the infirmity, but his contention that it was epilepsy rather than ophthalmia is not by any means so convincing. He has shown also somewhere, but I have not the reference, that S. Luke is found in his company when he is suffering from attacks of the disease. In his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians*, iv. 14, he notices that "S. Luke's first appearance in company with S. Paul, Acts xvi. 10, nearly synchronises with an attack of the Apostle's constitutional malady"; but this matter is more fully dealt with elsewhere, I think.

are an undying witness to his friend's fidelity, "Only Luke is with me." 2 Tim. iv. 11.

We have thought fit to dwell upon the close relationship that existed between them under all these varied circumstances, in order that we may account for the very striking unanimity with which they regarded the chief questions of faith and doctrine. One of the foremost of these was the admission of the Gentiles into the Christian covenant; and if S. Paul has appropriated the designation of "the Apostle of the Gentiles," S. Luke has established a right to be called "the Evangelist of the Gentiles." In nothing has the aim of the latter more nearly approximated to the preaching of the former, than in the desire to establish by his record of Christ's teaching the universality of redemption through the sacrifice of the Cross. The keynote is struck in the Genealogy, when the Redeemer's human descent is traced back not only, as it is by S. Matthew, to Abraham, "the father of the faithful," for the satisfaction of the Jews, but to Adam, the son of God, who was the father of all men.

The unanimity of their opinions.

On the universality of redemption.

A number of sayings and acts follow, which all bear upon, and tend to enforce, the same great principle. At the Presentation in the Temple the

aged Simeon makes a prophetic announcement, and places it in the forefront of the prediction, that the salvation which his eyes had been permitted to see was for all "the peoples" of the world, "a light to lighten the Gentiles" as well as, and even before, "the glory of Israel." S. Matthew and S. Luke both record the great advent cry of Christ's forerunner, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord," but the latter alone assigns the reason for His coming, that it was for the universal reception of the whole human race, "and all flesh shall see the salvation of God."

The salvation of the Gentiles.

iii. 6.

The first sermon which Christ preached in a Jewish Synagogue, we learn from S. Luke, closed with such a clear proclamation of the same fact, that it roused the indignation and anger of those who regarded redemption solely as their own prerogative; for it was nothing less than this which underlay the illustrations of Elijah's visit to the heathen widow in Sarepta, and Elisha's cleansing of Naaman the Syrian.

iv. 17-28.

The Mission of the Seventy disciples is narrated in these pages alone, and there are reasons for believing that it was because it witnessed to the Catholicity of the Gospel message. The number seventy had acquired in the Jewish mind a sym-

bolical reference to the heathen nations; it is noticed in the Talmud especially in connection with the Feast of Tabernacles; "they offer seventy bullocks for the seventy nations, to make atonement for them, that the rain may fall upon the fields of all the world." The association probably originated in the enumeration of the names of the seventy nations in Genesis x., which were supposed to make up the human race. In favour of the above view we notice the absence of the charge which had been given to the Twelve, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not"; and it is very significant of S. Luke's mind, that in his record of this apostolic commission he omitted altogether the limitations which Christ had imposed. To S. Matthew, with his Jewish aspirations, it deserved to be emphasised, and he does not hesitate to place it in the forefront of the charge; to S. Luke, whose sympathies were wide as the world, it was comparatively unimportant, especially when taken in connection with the Mission of the Seventy which follows in the next chapter.

Lightfoot's Hor. Talm. S. John vii. 2.

Corn. à Lapide on Gen. xi. 32.

S. Matt. x. 5.

That our Lord had "other sheep" which were not of the Jewish fold the Evangelist shows again and again; the barrier between Jew and Samaritan

Our Lord's favour of the Samaritans.

must be broken down, and those who had no dealings with each other must learn to live together as friends. The Sons of Thunder, he said, had forgotten the spirit of Christianity when they asked Jesus to call down fire to consume the inhospitable Samaritan village. He inculcated a kindred principle as he pictured the Priest and Levite forgetting the sacred obligation of mercy, and leaving it to a Samaritan; or when he narrated the miracle in which out of ten lepers the only one who showed any gratitude for his cure was a despised Samaritan. It was all intended to prepare the way for the extension of spiritual privileges beyond the horizon of Jewish exclusiveness, to show that as S. Paul taught, there is "neither Jew nor Greek," but all are one in Christ Jesus; and it is to the third Evangelist that we owe the knowledge that He Himself taught it.

XIV.

The Medical Phraseology of the Gospel.

When we were writing about S. Matthew's Gospel we found undesigned coincidences which helped to confirm the tradition that it was written by a "publican." Similar evidence may be drawn from S. Luke's Gospel to show that its writer belonged to the medical profession; the use of technical language is a marked characteristic both of his Gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles. S. Luke had been brought up for the calling of a physician; and when he wrote the Gospel, he must have fallen into the habit, common to many professions, but especially marked in men who practise the healing art, of expressing himself in medical language, and using figures of speech taken from the Materia Medica; and that, not only in speaking of disease and its cure, but when dealing with ordinary topics. We shall find it abundantly illustrated throughout the third Gospel.

Undesigned coincidences.

Look first at some of the miracles recorded by

Illustrations from two miracles. S. Luke v. 18; xiii. 11.

him[1]: for example, the healing of the "man which was taken with a palsy." and the restoration of the woman "which had a spirit of infirmity."

The man sick of the palsy.

S. Matthew and S. Mark, who also give an account of the former, describe the man in the original Greek as "a paralytic";[2] but there is nothing in this word to imply that he had anything more than a tendency to paralysis. That is the strict significance of words terminating as this does, though in popular usage it was not so limited. The above Evangelists seem to have known nothing of its more exact meaning; but S. Luke looked at the case with a professional knowledge of sickness and disease, and recognised at once that it was a more serious case than the term "paralytic" implied, and spoke of him as a "paralysed"[3] man, *i.e.* one who had actually had a stroke and lost the use of his limbs; and herein the physician Evangelist is in

[1] The whole subject has been investigated by Hobart, in a treatise on *The Medical Language of S. Luke*, mainly in view of showing that the Gospel and the Acts were written by the same author. He was the first writer to examine carefully the similarity of S. Luke's language with that of the old Greek medical authorities.

[2] παραλυτικός.

[3] παραλελυμένος, the past pass. part. The medical writers invariably used the verb in its passive form, when they spoke of one who had had a stroke, *e.g.*, γλῶσσαν παραλελυμένος.

exact accord with the old Greek Medical Writers,[1] with the works of some of whom he had evidently made himself familiar.

The woman with the spirit of infirmity.

The second of these miracles is narrated with many technical details. It seems to have attracted S. Luke's particular attention, for he alone notices it; and it was a case of special and aggravated infirmity, and as such it quickened his professional instincts. Now see how he describes it: "Behold, there was a woman which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed together, and could in no wise lift up herself. And when Jesus saw her, He called her to Him, and said unto her, Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity. And He laid His hands on her, and immediately she was made straight." Almost every expression that the Evangelist uses indicates "the accuracy of a trained observer."[2] The first question that a doctor asks his patient is the duration of his malady—how long he has been suffering from it? So here S. Luke notices that it was a chronic case,

[1] Hippocrates, who wrote in the fourth and fifth centuries B.C., and Galen in the second A.D. The latter often uses the language of his predecessor, from whom S. Luke had taken it.

[2] We do not mean to imply that S. Luke was an eye-witness, but he realised the picture when it was set before him, and put the account which he had received into technical language.

of eighteen years' standing, just as in another history S. Luke says of Æneas that he had been paralysed and had kept his bed for eight years. The woman was afflicted with what is technically known as "a spinal curvature"; for the two expressions in which her symptoms are explained, "bowed together," and able "in no wise to lift up herself," are used by Galen of one suffering from this infirmity; and the two, describing her cure, that she was "loosed" and "made straight," refer to the "relaxation of the tendons," and the subsequent "straightening of the vertebræ of the spine," which are strictly medical terms. If a doctor had been asked to give a scientific account of the disease and its cure, he could hardly have done it with greater accuracy.

Acts ix. 33.

From two of the Parables. x. 30-37. xvi. 19-31.

The same characteristic phenomenon belongs to two Parables which are peculiar to S. Luke's Gospel, viz., "the Good Samaritan," and "Dives and Lazarus." In the former we read that "a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was; and when he saw him, he had compassion on him, and went to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him."

The Good Samaritan.

S. Luke had been familiarised in his profession with all that was done to alleviate wounds: the bandaging, to stop the flow of blood; the injection of wine to cleanse, of oil to soothe the inflammation; and the direction to the landlord to see that the patient was carefully nursed—all are provided for in similar cases and precisely the same language in the Pharmacopœia of the ancients. So again in the second Parable. The beggar was full of sores; and the rich man craved for water to cool his tongue, being tormented in the flames. The first expression belongs to cases of chronic ulceration; while the tormenting pain, expressed by a word, used frequently by S. Luke but nowhere else in the New Testament, is noticed again and again in the old treatises; while the same may be repeated of the "cooling" of a parched and burning limb. There are, moreover, in Abraham's remonstrance of the rich man, two words, which will serve to illustrate the propensity of doctors to draw figures from their professional vocabulary, even when speaking of other than medical subjects. He said, "Beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed." It would hardly be thought that there is anything technical here; but both the noun and the verb in this sense are peculiar to

Dives and Lazarus.

S. Luke,[1] who knew them well in his medical authorities, the one for the "cavity" in ulcers and gangrene which refuses to heal up: the other, either of a weapon so firmly planted in a wound that it cannot be drawn, or of a disease too deeply seated for anything to eradicate it.

The Agony in Gethsemane.

There is, however, a more striking example of the use of medical language than any of these, in his record of what took place in the Garden of Gethsemane; and it attracts our notice especially because the other Evangelists, who have left us much longer narratives of it, enter into none of the exact and technical details of our Lord's suffering which S. Luke dwells upon. "And there appeared an angel unto Him from heaven, strengthening Him. And being in an agony He prayed more earnestly: and His sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground. And when He rose up from prayer, and was come to His disciples, He found them sleeping for sorrow." Here are no less than four circumstances, which were passed over by his fellow Evangelists, and all of them of a character calculated to excite the interest of a physician.

xxii. 43-45.

[1] στηρίζω is used many times in New Testament, but twice by S. Luke in this sense, and by him alone. Elsewhere it signifies to strengthen.

There is first the relief of the physical prostration[1] by the angel's visit; and to describe this he employs a word in a sense quite familiar to medical writers, but without a single parallel elsewhere in the New Testament or in Classical Greek.[2] The agony, again, is the struggle which doctors often witness in a patient passing through some severe and excruciating pain; while the sweat was an important symptom, carefully watched in certain sicknesses. Indeed, there are special treatises dealing with the causes and the different kinds of sweat, in which, singularly enough, some are associated with an agony or struggle, and not only so, but one kind is even likened to the exsudation[3] of blood. The drops of blood to which it is here compared, as it fell from the Sufferer's face, are, in the original, clots such as are formed by coagulation in the veins. The last thing to be noticed in S. Luke's description is that the disciples were sleeping "for

Theophrastus, De sudoribus.

[1] It must be physical support that was given by the angels, as in the Temptation, S. Matt. iv. 11, for our Lord's Divinity precludes the idea of His needing spiritual strength.

[2] ἄγγελος ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. The verb is invariably used in an intransitive sense; cf. Aristotle's *Eth. N.* 10. 9, 14, and the uncompounded form means always, to prevail, to be strong. Hippocrates uses both forms in the above sense.

[3] The word is differently spelt with much caprice: oddly enough, generally in medical works, exudation.

S. Matt. xxvi. 43. S. Mark xiv. 40.

sorrow." Elsewhere we are told that "their eyes were heavy," and that they were "asleep"; but the physician looks for the cause of failure at such a crisis. He had often seen cases of a similar kind, though less aggravated in degree, where long watching and painful anxiety had produced the same result, and he notices the extenuating circumstances for their apparent unconcern: they were "sleeping for sorrow."

Corroboration of the genuineness of S. Luke's narrative, vv. 43, 44.

I have dwelt upon this passage not only because it supplies such a forcible illustration of our subject, but to call attention to the internal evidence which it supplies of its genuineness. The Revised Translation notices that many ancient authorities omit the two verses; and they have often been questioned since the fourth century. There is something so intensely human in the sufferings here described, that it is more than probable that suspicion was first cast upon the passage, in order to uphold orthodox views in the Arian Controversy. The Fathers of this period deny its genuineness,[1] but those who wrote two centuries earlier were wholly unaware of the least doubtfulness,[2] and we

Epiph. Ancoratus.

[1] S. Hilary. In Græcis et in Latinis complurimis vel de adveniendo angelo vel de sudore sanguinis nil scriptum reperiri.

[2] Just. Mart. *c. Tryph.* 103. *ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι* (memoirs) . . . *ὅτι ἱδρὼς ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι κατεχεῖτο αὐτοῦ εὐχομένου.*

gladly cling to the earlier testimony, and find a strong corroboration in the medical language of the text; for it could hardly have occurred to a forger to introduce such technical phenomena, instead of following the simpler narrative of S. Matthew and S. Luke.

S. Jerome. S. Hilary. Justin Martyr. Irenæus. Hippolytus.

All these illustrations of the use of technical phraseology, and many more with which we are familiar but have no need to examine,[1] are amply sufficient evidence in confirmation of the truth of the tradition, that S. Luke, the beloved physician, was the author of the Third Gospel. Moreover, they are of distinct help in showing how the Holy Spirit, while guiding and directing the Sacred Writers into all truth, left their individuality and natural peculiarities of style and diction undisturbed.

[1] *e.g.* "The great fever" of Simon's mother-in-law: the "moisture" which the seed lacked in stony places: "the eye of a needle," etc.

XV.

The Exaltation of Womanhood.

We have seen how this Gospel helped to break down the wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, and to give point to the first clause in S. Paul's verdict on the effect of Christianity, "There is neither Jew nor Greek"; it is no less clear that it contributed largely to the abolition of another distinction, and illustrates also the last clause: "there is neither male nor female: for all are one in Christ Jesus." Indeed, it has been very aptly described as "the Gospel of womanhood become Christian."

Gal. iii. 28.

The condition of woman before Christ.

A very brief notice of the condition of woman before the coming of our Lord will enable us to estimate the extent of the change to which S. Luke bears witness. Among the Jews her position in the world was better than that which was assigned to her in the surrounding nations. The Old Testament history contains many names of women who

rose to eminence and became famous in various spheres of life and duty. Perhaps there is no more beautiful and charming description in the whole range of literature, than that which is given in the Book of Proverbs of the virtuous woman; but that such a character was most exceptional, few would doubt. The curse of polygamy and facilities for divorce on the man's side alone, with all the degradation entailed by such a system, made contempt for woman an almost instinctive principle in Hebrew society. It was, moreover, stereotyped, as it were, by the stamp of religion, for every male Jew was taught to thank God every day of his life that he had not been born a heathen, a slave, or a woman.

Among the Jews.

xxxi. 10-31.

Pir'ke Avoth, tr. by Dr. Taylor, 29.

Look next at her social position in the heathen nations.[1] Notwithstanding the spread of civilisation in Greece, women were left almost wholly uneducated. No women, but such as were known to be unchaste, were permitted to attend public lectures or to associate with the learned. It is a fearful reflection that knowledge could only be purchased by women at the price of their virtue. Aristotle said that their proper place was between freedmen and slaves; and Plato, even in an ideal

Among the heathen.

Poetic. xv.

[1] This has been illustrated in a variety of conditions in *The Divine Origin of Christianity*, by Dr. Stone of Brooklyn.

Repub. v. 457.

Republic, advocated a community of wives, than which nothing can possibly be more degrading.

At Rome women at times attained to considerable distinction, but all the laws touching their status were based upon the fundamental principle, that she should never be independent; the most famous of all, the Voconian Law, which lasted on for centuries, made it impossible even for a daughter to inherit her father's property, if he was an enrolled citizen.

Gaius. Instit. ii. 273.

S. August. de Civ. Dei, iii. 21.

Christianity changed all this; and in their witness to the change S. Luke and S. Paul are again in striking harmony. There are no doubt abundant passages where S. Paul expresses the subordination of the wife to her husband, and denies to women the exercise of definite public functions, but as regards religion and morality he makes them joint-heirs with men of every privilege, and gives them scope to attain the highest dignity. He associates them with himself as fellow-workers; at Philippi they laboured with him in the Gospel; at Thessalonica not a few of "the chief women," and at Berea women of rank and honourable birth joined themselves to him; and when he wrote to the Romans he mentions by name for commendation or greeting no less than nine faithful women.

Eph. v. 22.

1 Cor. xi. 3; xiv. 34.

1 Tim. ii. 11, 12.

S. Paul's estimate of women.

S. Luke had been with the Apostle in all these places, and this new revelation of womanhood made a strong impression upon his mind, so that when he set himself to select materials from our Lord's life and sayings, all that bore upon the exaltation of women had an especial attraction for him. He has told us both what our Lord did for them and what they were privileged to do for Him.

S. Luke's portrait of the Blessed Virgin.

The picture that is drawn for us in the Third Gospel of the life and character of the Blessed Virgin far exceeds in beauty and interest all that is written of her elsewhere. S. Mark only gives us her name. S. Matthew tells of her betrothal to Joseph, of his first suspicions of her unchastity, and of their complete removal by the interposition of an angel; and we are assured that she was destined to fulfil the ancient prophecy, "Behold, a virgin shall be with child." Then he speaks of certain historic facts, that she witnessed the adoration of the Magi, that she fled into Egypt, and returned to the land of Israel, but no more. There is a "spell of silence" over her mind and character; the other Evangelist only tells us what she did: S. Luke tells us that which we want to know far more than this, what she was. It is in his pages that we read of her wonderment at the salutation of the angel, "Hail, i. 28, 32, 34, 38, 45.

thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women"; of her natural perplexity at being told that she was about to become the mother of "the Son of the Highest," of her eager inquiry, "How shall this be?" of her faith, "Blessed is she that believed": and after all this of the complete self-surrender to the higher, holier will, in absolute reliance on the angelic assurance, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word."

Again, when the heavenly messenger had left, we have her journeying in haste over the hills to visit her kinswoman, Elizabeth, of whom he had told her so much, and her outburst of praise and thanksgiving in the inspired Magnificat.

Then we read of the Birth at Bethlehem, and see her in all her tender motherhood wrapping the Babe in swaddling-clothes and laying him in the manger-cradle, too modest to speak of the honour bestowed upon her, keeping all that she had seen and heard to herself, pondering in her heart what it could possibly mean.

S. Luke, too, opens a chamber in her after-life, at least to any thoughtful imagination, for though he does not say in so many words what was the effect upon her of Simeon's prediction, yet it is enough,

in the light of what he has revealed of her char- ii. 35.
acter, that he has placed it on record, "A sword shall pierce through thy own soul also."

Once more, there is that other scene in the Temple, and her sad confession of the sorrowful search which she and her husband had made for her lost Child; and then we imagine her maternal pride and glad surprise when she saw Him holding the great doctors, who sat in Moses' seat, spellbound by His knowledge; and again her reluctance to publish abroad what had occurred, while she "kept all these sayings in her heart."

What an insight it gives us into the deepest recesses of her soul and character! Surely we need have no misgivings about the reality of teaching to be found in the mediæval legend, of which we have a trace in the Catacombs in the rude drawing of the Blessed Virgin, "one of seven which Luca painted,"[1] to which, also, frequent illustrations in Christian Art bear witness in all the great galleries of Europe. Who does not know the canvas in which we see S. Luke on bended knee transferring the

[1] The legend is of Eastern origin. It may have originated in the real existence of a painter named Luca, and the West, which knew but of one S. Luke, may have easily confounded the painter and Evangelist. Cf. Mrs. Jameson, *Legends of the Madonna*, xxix.

gracious likeness, while Raphael watches intently from behind? Some of us, perhaps, have visited the chapel in Santa Maria's Church in the Via Lata at Rome, where we are told that it has been handed down from the first ages that S. Luke the Evangelist wrote, and painted the effigy of the Virgin-mother of God. We need not stay to inquire narrowly into the truth of the legend; it is probably only the poetic expression[1] of the undeniable fact that he has left to the world in the pages of his Gospel a perfect portraiture: and when it is added that he always carried her portrait with him on his travels, and that it worked wonders and helped him in his preaching, it surely means that he often appealed to what he had written of her beautiful character, and rarely in vain.

The legend of S. Luke's portrait-painting.

Now S. Luke not only puts before us this perfect type of womanhood, which of itself would have sufficed to raise in the eyes of men the standard of feminine grace and dignity, but he goes on throughout his Gospel always keeping before us the new position which women assumed under the influence

[1] It is unfortunate that so many persons put aside mediæval legends as unprofitable reading, instead of remembering that they are only romantic teaching often of very important truths and principles. There is really much that may be learned by a patient investigation of what they were intended to inculcate.

of Christ. So it is that he dwells upon the beautiful story of Elizabeth, second only to that of the Blessed Virgin; upon the conduct of Anna, the devout prophetess, giving thanks in the Temple, and becoming the messenger to waiting Israel that the redemption of Jerusalem was about to be accomplished.

He alone tells of the raising of the widow of Nain's son from the dead; and it is from him that we have such frequent notice of the company of devout women, who in gratitude for deliverance from the power of evil spirits, or for the healing of physical infirmities, ministered to Him of their substance in every city or village wherever He went,—Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, the wife of Herod's chamberlain, and Susanna, and many others. What a thought it is of Him, "living by the love of those whom His love had made to live"!

The devout women.

How much we should have missed if the same Evangelist had not left us the history of the "woman who was a sinner," drawn by the ineffable attraction of Jesus to throw herself at His feet in the Pharisee's house, and by the power of her penitence and the greatness of her love winning forgiveness for her many sins!

We learn elsewhere of the two sisters in that

The two sisters.

ideal home at Bethany, for how could S. John, who knew better than any one else how dear they were to his Lord, do otherwise than speak of them? But of the other three Evangelists S. Luke alone gives us an insight into their life and character, Mary absorbed in her Master's teaching, Martha distracted with household cares, the one receiving his gentle remonstrances, the other the much-cherished approval of the part which she had chosen. S. Matthew, S. Mark, and S. Luke have all recorded the healing of "one possessed with a devil, blind and dumb," which led to the blasphemous charge of the Pharisees that Jesus was in league with Beelzebub, but S. Luke alone has recorded an episode that followed, and "as He spake these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice and said unto Him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked."

x. 40-42.

S. Matt. xii. 22. S. Mark iii. 11. S. Luke xi. 14.

The women on the Via Crucis.

The last incident in connection with women peculiar to S. Luke exhibits almost more than anything our Lord's exceeding tenderness for them. He had borne unmoved the mockery and scourging, the weight of the cross, and the cruel impatience of those who led Him to His execution. All His own pain and "unknown sufferings" had been powerless to call forth a single word, but His silence was

broken at last by the sight of the daughters of Jerusalem as they wept and lamented. They were not the faithful women who had followed Him from Galilee; they were women from the city, part only of the promiscuous crowd, and there is nothing to indicate that their manifestation of grief was anything more than the natural outcome of a woman's sensibility in the presence of suffering. But S. Luke read in His conduct a mark of Divine favour, and an intense desire to influence them for good; and so we are told that, reading their past lives and all that lay deepest in their hearts, He cried in eager entreaty, "Weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, xxiii. 28. and for your children. For, behold, the days are coming, in the which they shall say, Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bare, and the paps which never gave suck."

In the consideration of all this we cannot but regard it as a distinct and characteristic feature of S. Luke's Gospel, that it reveals the fact of a new and more honourable position assigned to womanhood, as a direct outcome and blessed fruit of the Incarnation of Jesus Christ.

XVI.

The Woman that was a Sinner.

In the last chapter we pointed to the influence of S. Luke's Gospel on Christian Art, through his portraiture of the Blessed Virgin. Painter after painter has endeavoured to represent on canvas some at least of the beautiful features in her life and character of which we read in the pages of S. Luke. There is nothing to regret, but everything to admire, in what Art has done to familiarise the world with the person of the Madonna. But the same cannot be said in regard to the Magdalene, whose portraits are second only in number to those of the Mother of our Lord; and the identification of her with "the woman that was a sinner" is indirectly, though unwarrantably, due to S. Luke. All the Evangelists have written about Mary Magdalene; only S. Luke has told us of the unnamed woman, who anointed our Lord's feet, and received from Him pardon and forgiveness for her many sins; and it is through the connection,

Christian Art on the penitent woman.

in which he has recorded this remarkable episode, with the mention of Mary Magdalene, that Christian artists have been unconsciously led so widely astray. Hers is the first name that follows in the history. viii. 2.

In the New Testament there are four records of an anointing of our Lord by a woman. In three cases it is one and the same account, with slight varieties of detail,[1] of what took place at the house of Simon the leper, in Bethany, at the last Passover in preparation for His burial, and the woman's name was Mary, the sister of Lazarus. In the fourth, the scene of the anointing was the house of Simon, a Pharisee, probably at Nain,[2] for that was the last place mentioned by name, certainly in Galilee and at an early stage in our Lord's ministry, for it was before the parable of the Sower, which is regarded as the first which fell from His lips. All that is told directly of the chief actor is that she was "a woman in the city which was

Different anointings in the Gospels. S. Matt. xxvi. 6-13. S. Mark xiv. 3-9. S. John xii. 2-11. S. Luke vii. 37-50.

[1] The chief is that S. John alone mentions the anointing of the feet and the wiping with the hair—the others speak of the head, and say nothing of the wiping. Another difference is that the objector to the waste in S. John is Judas; in the other accounts, His disciples.

[2] "The city" usually means Capernaum, but if "a woman who was a sinner in the city" be the right reading, it probably only means a public harlot, without intending to define the place.

a sinner," but according to the traditional belief, supported by the best reading, "a woman which was a sinner in the city," there can be no doubt that she was notorious for the life of shame that she led.

The fact that she was not named by the Evangelist has led to an unfortunate desire to supply what, no doubt for a wise purpose, was left wanting.

Not Mary of Bethany.

By some she has been identified with Mary of Bethany, and her conduct has been adduced to illustrate the force of gratitude. Unable to tear herself from the company of her Deliverer she sat at His feet till her sister complained; and she repeated at the close of His ministry, and with more lavish expenditure, the anointing which was associated with her forgiveness at its beginning: "to whom much is forgiven, the same loveth much." The theory is based upon S. John's statement; after speaking of Mary and her sister Martha, he

xi. 2.

added, "It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped His feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick." He had not yet mentioned the anointing at the last Passover, and it is argued that he would not so speak before he had narrated the circumstance to which he alluded;

it must therefore refer, it is said, to that other occasion, of which his hearers had read in the pages of S. Luke. They forget that when S. John wrote his Gospel that which had been recorded by S. Matthew and S. Mark could hardly fail to have been known. S. Augustine thinks that both anointings were by the same person.[1] S. Ambrose[2] could not make up his mind. Our natural instincts prompt us to reject the identity on the ground that there is absolutely no trace of evidence, either in Scripture or in early tradition, that Mary of Bethany had ever lived a life of shame.

The Roman theory that all the anointings are by the same woman.

By a second theory, which is widely accepted in the Roman Catholic Church, "the woman that was a sinner" is identified not only with Mary of Bethany but also with Mary Magdalene, so that they are not three different persons but one and the same. No explanation has been given of the fact that there is nothing whatever to connect two of them at any rate together, and to account for S. John describing the same woman sometimes as of Magdala and sometimes of Bethany. Moreover, he says expressly of Bethany that it was "the town

[1] Nihil aliud intelligendum arbitror, nisi non quidem aliam fuisse mulierem, quæ peccatrix tunc accessit ad pedes Jesu: *de Consensu Evang.* ii. 154.

[2] *In loc.*

of Mary," which would be quite unnatural if he had elsewhere implied that Magdala was her native place, as he certainly did.

Not to be identified with Mary Magdalene.

The third theory, however, is the one which calls for the fullest consideration, because it has laid complete hold of the popular mind. It is that which, while separating the sister of Lazarus from Mary Magdalene, assigns to the latter the anointing recorded by S. Luke. The chief authority for this view is Gregory the Great, from whom it passed into the Roman Breviary; and from this, and its later adoption in Christian Art, the Magdalene has been commonly regarded as the representative of repentant sinners. Gregory speaks of the "seven devils" as the "seven deadly sins." Magdalenes have become almost as popular as Madonnas since the thirteenth century. In every gallery of pictures—Venetian, Florentine, Bolognese, French, Spanish, and Dutch—"the penitent Magdalene" has her place. Her invariable emblem is an alabaster box or vase: sometimes in her hand or at her feet, sometimes borne by an angel at her side. She is painted, too, with long golden hair flowing over her shoulders, kneeling before a cross or actually embracing it.

From painting the idea has passed into poetry,

especially hymnody;[1] and it is in danger of becoming stereotyped through music,[2] which impresses the popular mind almost more effectively than any other influence. In England it was fixed from the time of Osmund by the Sarum Missal, in which the Gospel appointed for the Feast of S. Mary Magdalene, July 22nd, was the passage from S. Luke containing the account of the anointing by "the woman which was a sinner." The compilers of the First Prayer-Book in 1549 adopted the same, but the revisers of 1552 hesitated to perpetuate the supposed identity, and being unable to agree[3] upon another passage, they omitted the Commemoration altogether. The name of S. Mary Magdalene regained a place in the Calendar in the reign of James I., but only as a "black-letter day." The translators of the Bible, however, under the same king, accepted the pre-Reformation belief, and in the heading of S. Luke vii. wrote: "sheweth by

[1] Cf. *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, 252, 459, 466.

[2] Cf. especially Stainer's *Cantata of the Magdalene*, which is so much to be deplored as giving sanction to the theory in this generation, when so much is being done to illustrate the Scriptures, with due regard to criticism.

[3] I have not been able to verify this reason, but it has long been the traditional one, and it is certainly impossible to find a more likely one. Mary Magdalene could not have been excluded on the acknowledged ground for exclusion from the Calendar, viz., that the Saint had no place in the Sacred History.

occasion of Mary Magdalene, how He is a friend to sinners."

The above testimony shows how strong and widespread is the popular belief that Mary Magdalene had once lived the life of an abandoned woman. If we set aside her assumed connection with the sinner of whom S. Luke writes, her character is one of the most beautiful and attractive in the Gospel history. The conviction of this, combined with the realisation of the very slender premises upon which the whole theory of identity is constructed, makes us extremely anxious to subject the evidence to the strictest scrutiny. It is quite true that there is in the Christian eyes something very attractive in the thought of the deepest penitence, something to rejoice over in the complete recovery of a fallen woman; but there can hardly be a question that one whose life has been pure throughout is more precious in the sight of God and more highly esteemed in the judgment of men. We know how effectual repentance may be to efface the stains of impurity and to reform a sinful past, yet we cling rather to the unfallen who needs no repentance; and in the absence of anything like convincing proof to the contrary, such we believe Mary Magdalene to have been.

The Magdalene's character inconsistent with the identity.

Let us test, then, the evidence upon which we think that she ought not to be identified with "the woman that was a sinner."

Arguments against the identification.

First from Holy Scripture: if S. Luke had intended to give the name of the sinner, who anointed our Lord in the Pharisee's house, he would surely have done it in the narrative that was to be for ever associated with her. No possible reason can be conjectured why he should carefully conceal it on one page and disclose it as a perfectly natural thing on the next.[1] The circumstances are such as would lead him to draw a veil over her identity, to save her from the inevitable notoriety which the mention of her name would have given her, wherever she went. It would entirely defeat his object if he had her in his mind, and meant his readers to identify the two persons, when he went on to say immediately after, that "Mary Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils," was one of those who companied with Jesus throughout every city and village. viii. 1, 2.

Secondly, it is a pure assumption that her possession by evil spirits was the consequence of her

[1] The narrative of the anointing closes the seventh chapter; the eighth opens with the names of those who accompanied our Lord, and the first of them is Mary Magdalene.

Demoniac possession not necessarily indicative of sinful lust.

sins; it cannot be gainsaid that a life of sensual indulgence was calculated so to weaken the character as to leave a sinner an easier prey to such violent assaults from the powers of evil, but there is nothing in any of the recorded instances to associate the two things by a necessary link. Our Lord's conduct on other occasions in dealing with the "possessed," lends no countenance to such an idea. His dominant feeling is that of compassion; there is not a trace of reproof for the past or of warning for the future. Compare in illustration two familiar cases: that of the demoniac boy at the foot of the Transfiguration Mount, and that of the woman taken in adultery. In the former, He rebuked the foul spirit. "Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him"; in the latter, He sealed her pardon: "Neither do I condemn thee," with the earnest entreaty, "go, and sin no more."

S. Mark ix. 25.

S. John viii. 11.

Look again at the whole conduct of the sinful woman in the house of Simon. It is as unlike that of a demoniac as we can possibly imagine. There is no divided will; no double personality; no distracting frenzy; but all is done deliberately and calmly, as by one in full possession of her faculties. The suggestion that the evil spirits had been cast out previously, and that the act of anointing marked

her gratitude, is quite untenable, for she must then have been introduced, not as a woman that was a sinner, but as one who had been delivered from the powers of evil.

Thirdly, it is hardly probable that one who had been notorious in the city for her sinful life should have gained admission at once, without any period of probation, into that inner circle of devout women who accompanied Jesus and ministered to His wants wherever He went.

The Testimony of the early Fathers.

The testimony of the early Fathers is certainly not such as to outweigh these considerations. There is nothing even approaching to unanimity. S. Clement of Alexandria[1] clearly knew nothing of the supposed identity of the two women. He writes on "the use of ointment" and describes the episode recorded by S. Luke but with all the Evangelist's vagueness. The chief actor is simply "the woman that was a sinner"; whereas, if it had been known that she was Mary Magdalene, writing as he did when she was no longer alive, he could have had no object in suppressing such an interesting fact.

Tertullian[2] treats the case in exactly the same way.

[1] *Pædag.* ii. viii.

[2] *de Pudicit.* xi.

The Eastern Church.

In the Eastern Church, Origen[1] bears witness to the existence of the belief of many in their identity and examines the theory, but distinctly rejects it. S. Chrysostom[2] says that in all four records of anointing in the Gospels the person "appears" to be the same, but he does not accept this view. It was doubtless through their influence that it has always been rejected throughout the whole Eastern Church.

The Western Church.

In the Western Church we have noticed that the testimony of S. Ambrose and S. Augustine rather favours the identity of the woman that was a sinner with Mary of Bethany. S. Gregory the Great, however, regards the "seven devils" cast out of the Magdalene as the "seven deadly sins"; but no one can say that he has given sufficient reason, or anything like an approach to it, for rejecting the internal evidence from the Gospels.

In our judgment[3] the popular belief has inflicted

[1] There are frequent references in Origen: Tract. 35 *in S. Matt.*; 77 Lat.; Tr. ii. *in Cantic.* He spoke once as though there were three anointings and by three persons, though he seems to have changed his mind. He clearly separated the one who anointed the feet from her who anointed the head: Tr. i. *in Cant.*

[2] Hom. 80 *in S. Matt.*

[3] I know that Dr. Pusey held the identity, and I have examined his arguments carefully, but the weight of the internal evidence of the Gospel above stated is certainly not overborne by anything

a grievous wrong upon one of the most beautiful characters in the New Testament; and on this ground we have availed ourselves of this opportunity to try to vindicate her memory. It is not from any doubt that one who had led the most degraded life could by repentance and divine forgiveness have risen to such a standard of devotion as we see in the history of Mary Magdalene; all things are possible through the restoring power of a merciful God.

There is no doubt either, that it would serve as a potent influence to reclaim a fallen woman, to be able to point to a definite and striking illustration such as this; but we have no right to affix the awful stigma of a sinful past, however complete the recovery, without incontestable proof of the fact. That this is wanting in the case of Mary Magdalene few can deny.

that he says. I am more sorry to differ from Canon Carter, to whom I owe my first instruction in Catholic doctrine; but I have noticed that the identity is most firmly held by those who have had most to do with penitents. The wish to be able to illustrate the power of repentance by a striking example has, I think, prejudiced their judgment.

XVII.

Revelations of the Unseen World.

THERE are abundant intimations in the other Gospels, apart from the mention of heaven, of the existence of a spiritual world, but they are confined almost exclusively to revelations of angelic beings, and these are by no means frequent. S. John has recorded the promise to Nathanael that he should

S. John i. 51. "see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man"; but it is in

S. Luke lifts the veil of the spiritual world. the pages of S. Luke that we are most familiarised with angels' visits, and there alone that we obtain glimpses into the mode of life and the thoughts and feelings of the disembodied spirits. Indeed, it is not too much to say that to S. Luke, and to none other of the Evangelists, we owe all that we can learn about the life of the soul in the intermediate state between death and the resurrection. Some revelation of this kind seems to have been called for through the false beliefs of the Gentiles, for whom primarily at least he wrote his Gospel. It

was in heathen poetry and philosophy that the future life had been surrounded by an atmosphere of fable and fancy.

Definite truths about the soul revealed.

Now we are taught certain very definite truths concerning the other world in this Gospel, of which these are the chief; that at death the spirit does not die but only changes its manner of life; that it does not sink into an unconscious sleep, but remains sensible to feelings of pain and pleasure; that the recollection of the past is neither obliterated nor dormant; that an interest in what is going on in this world still remains; that there is a companionship of spirit with spirit; and finally, that the spirits of the good and bad are separated even before the Judgment. These truths, we think, may be clearly deduced from one or other of the different passages to be considered. In some cases the information is not so definite as might be wished; but in a subject of such deep interest, where the notices are but scanty, it will not be wondered at, if we draw from them all the inferences which reverent thought and reflection seem to suggest. What, for instance, could be more apparently unimportant than a brief and incidental notice, which we find in S. Luke alone, in the account of the raising from the dead of Jairus's

daughter? S. Matthew tells us that when Jesus went into his house. He "took her by the hand and the maid arose." S. Mark, again, records the same with the addition of the words that He spake: "He took the damsel by the hand, and said under her, Talitha Kumi; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, arise. And straightway the damsel arose, and walked." Neither S. Matthew nor S. Mark had any special interest in the unseen world, and make no allusion to it; but S. Luke's thoughts travelled on beyond the chamber, where her body was laid, to the land of waiting spirits, and before she sat up at the Lord's bidding, he tells us that "her spirit came again," came as it would have done, had it not been thus summoned beforehand, on the day of the Resurrection.

ix. 25.

The spirit of Jairus's daughter.

v. 41, 42.

xvi. 1-8.

Again, S. Luke has preserved that perplexing[1]

[1] There is perhaps no parable more perplexing for the ordinary reader: the chief difficulty lies in verses 8 and 9, "And the lord commended the unjust steward because he had done wisely," and "make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness"; but in the 8th the lord should be "his lord," *i.e.* not the Lord Jesus, but the man's master; and his commendation does not imply that it was because he knew the means by which the steward had ingratiated himself with the tenants—there is no hint of this—all he knew was the fact. In the 9th verse "of" (ἐκ) should be "by means of": use, *i.e.* money, which is usually spent on unrighteous purposes for a righteous one.

parable of the Unjust Steward, in which Christ lifts the veil of the unseen world, and shows to us the spirits of the faithful, who have been helped in life, awaiting on the other side the advent of the spirits of their earthly benefactors. What He says about it points to two or three important facts; the spirit does not lose consciousness when the body dies. "When ye fail"[1]; when this earthly scene passes away, the spirit hastens to join its kindred spirits in the Intermediate State. It testifies also to the certainty of recognition among Christian friends after death; and also implies that the faithful departed retain their interest in those whom they have left behind, and watch for reunion.

The Parable of the Unjust Steward.

It is to S. Luke that we are indebted for our knowledge of the promise which our Lord made to the penitent thief on the Cross; and this, when taken in combination with what is revealed elsewhere, is full of teaching on the life of the spirit beyond the grave: "To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise."[2] It was no assurance concerning

The penitent thief.

xxiii. 43.

[1] ὅταν ἐκλίπητε. There is another reading ἐκλείπῃ, with much greater authority; but it does not alter the sense, the time in both cases is the same.

[2] I have written an account of the different views of "Paradise" in chap. iv. of *The Intermediate State.*

the resurrection body in heaven, for he was to be with Christ that day in Paradise. which every Jew understood as "a place of divine pleasantness appointed for the spirits of the saints" between death and judgment.

Tertull. Apol. 57.

Now S. Peter has told us a great deal about the Spirit of Jesus after it left His Body: "Being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit; in which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison."—R. V. His human spirit, when separated from the flesh, acquired new powers of activity and usefulness in Hades. If, then, He was an example to men in death as well as in life, our work and influence will last on, yea, it may be, will be developed with an increased force in another world. Two of the earliest of the Fathers have given expression to their conviction of this: "those who had fallen asleep were quickened by the Apostles and teachers who preached the Name of the Son of God, and were made by them to know it"; and, "the Apostles, following the example of their Lord, preached the Gospel to those in Hades." It was then a companionship, or at least the conscious witness of work and ministry which our Lord promised to the penitent; and the prospect held out to him not only dispels all idea of sleep in

1 S. Pet. iii. 18.

Hermas Past. iii. xvi.

Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. vi.

death, but opens up the possibility of usefulness and activity in the disembodied state.

The Parable of Dives and Lazarus.

The parable, however, of the Rich Man and Lazarus is the passage in which S. Luke has recorded more than any other writer about the unseen world. It may be that it is a parable founded upon fact. Not a few early Fathers regarded it as historical; but in either case, whether historical or not, what it teaches cannot be other than true in principle. That there are difficulties connected with the interpretation is obvious; for though the scene is laid in the spiritual world, and our Lord is speaking only of spirits, yet we read in the story of the tongue of the rich man, of the cooling water, and of tormenting flame. But in such a case it is impossible to convey intelligible truths in any other way; figurative language alone can do this to a finite mind, which has no grasp of what is purely spiritual.

Irenæ. adv. Hær. ii. 62. Tert. de Anima, vii.

Now what we learn from the parable about the state after death is very considerable; it leaves on the mind a distinct conviction that there is a continuity of life in the two worlds: that the good receive in some measure their rewards of joy and comfort at once, and the bad their punishment of pain and remorse, though the fulness of the one

and the other will not be meted out till the final judgment. We are assured, moreover, that we retain our memory after death; "Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things." What a blow it strikes at all the fables of Lethe, from which the heathen believed that the souls of the departed drank in the other world, and forgot all that they had ever done in this! Again, the parable teaches how the recollection of the world which they have left quickens the interest of departed souls. If the rich man could pray with such intensity for his brethren, though by reason of his condition he had no claim to be heard, who can doubt that the faithful plead for us with no less passionate longing, only with greater efficacy and power, as being heirs of the promise in the fullest sense, "the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much."

S. James v. 16.

Now it is very probable when we recall the close connection between the teaching of S. Luke and S. Paul, that the Evangelist had been, in a measure at least, instructed by him who had been caught up "as far as the third heaven" and "into Paradise." The Apostle had experienced two raptures; and that which he mentions first was the highest state of glory and happiness; it is the Jewish equivalent

S. Paul and S. Luke on the subject of Paradise.

of the "heaven of heavens." Christian writers have commonly supposed that he was translated in spirit into "the company of the angelic hierarchy, and that there he mingled with the Seraphim and had the fruition of the Beatific Vision." Now seeing that this in its fulness belongs only to the final state, which follows the resurrection and judgment, it would not have answered the immediate purpose of the rapture, which was to nerve him for the trials and sufferings to which he was exposed. He was carried therefore into Paradise as well, the waiting-place of souls when the body dies. It was the same with the penitent thief, who needed, equally with S. Paul, the prospect of speedy relief and rest. He had asked only for a share in the future kingdom of glory, whenever the Lord should enter upon it, but he received the promise of an almost present reward—a speedy transition from pain to bliss—"to-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise."

It seems strange to us that the Apostle should have been perplexed by doubts on the conditions of his rapture; "whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell, God knoweth." Nothing but the belief that his spirit was for the time caught away from his body, enables us to solve the mystery, why neither he,

2 Cor. xii. 2.

nor those who were restored from death to life, have left any record or attempted description of what they had seen in Paradise.

2 Cor. x. 4. 1 Cor. ii. 9. The secret of the "unspeakable" words, or of what "eye hath not seen nor ear heard," is that no mere bodily perceptions can possibly describe or grasp what had revealed itself only to the spirit. What sealed the lips of S. Paul was the same that hushed Lazarus in silence, the impossibility of telling when encumbered with the flesh, what he had witnessed without that encumbrance.

How far S. Luke was indebted to S. Paul.

How much S. Luke owed to S. Paul of the information which he has given us of the unseen world, it is impossible to say. He may well have received from him his first impulse in dealing with the question, for they must have talked the subject over again and again, though, as we have said, the rapt Apostle could never unfold the details of his rapture. The recollection, however, of the fact, never passed away, and it imbued him with a strong sense of the reality of the invisible world. It was under this that he was able to say with Rom. viii. 18. confidence, "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us"; it was Phil. i. 23. this, too, which gave intensity to his longing to

depart for that state which he knew to be far better. These and other passages all help to convince us that what he had seen and experienced in the other world had left upon him a deep impression of surpassing beauty and bliss; and so far we may well believe that he influenced S. Luke and encouraged him under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to withdraw, as far as he was able, the veil of the unseen world, for the comfort and instruction of all who should read what he has written.

XVIII.

The Priesthood of Christ.

LEAVING the subordinate conceptions of the third Gospel, all of which have an interest of their own, we come to the consideration of that upon which the Evangelist concentrated his mind and purpose. Some modern writers[1] have imagined that this was "the face of a man," and that S. Luke's main object was to express the humanity of our Blessed Lord. It is true, we believe, only inasmuch as His Priesthood carried with it of necessity His manhood. "Every high-priest" is "taken from among men," because he can "have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is compassed with infirmity." If, then, Jesus Christ was to take the office, "it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren"; and S. Luke, when setting himself to exhibit the Priestly side of His manifold life, could not fail to

Why S. Luke puts Christ's manhood in the forefront.

Heb. v. 1, 2.

ii. 17.

[1] Cf. *Differences of the Four Gospels*, by Jukes.

show that He had this necessary qualification, and, as being born of a woman, was "touched with a feeling of our infirmities." It is for this reason that he lays so much stress in his opening chapters on His birth, childhood, and youth, all, that is, which established His preliminary qualification for the Priestly office. If, as the Gospel unfolds, His human features and characteristics are developed, we shall find that for the most part they are such as belong to the Priest, not those which are common to all men, as we see them in the portraiture of S. Mark's Gospel.

The ancient Church maintained this with singular unanimity, and appropriated the calf or ox, which was the chief sacrificial victim, as the emblem of S. Luke. The unique nature of Christ's office, in which He combined the twofold character of Priest and Victim, made an earthly type necessarily imperfect; but such as it was, the early Fathers readily accepted it. Nothing could adequately represent His offering the sacrifice of Himself and the pleading of its efficacy at the right hand of the Father. "In the midst of the elders stood a Lamb as it had been slain"—such was the Vision which S. John saw of Him Who had been "slain" to take away the sins of the world, and Who "stood,"

Christ's twofold character as Priest and Victim.

Rev. v. 6.

because He is risen and ascended, as our Advocate everliving to make intercession for us.

Ideas which cluster round the Priestly office.

Now Priesthood and Atonement are words which gather round themselves manifold ideas and associations. They call up at once thoughts of the Temple and the Altar, of sacrifice, of prayer and intercession and benediction, of absolution and remission of sins, and of the attributes of mercy, compassion, and sympathy. Is it too much to say that these are far more frequently and vividly illustrated in this Gospel than in any other Book of the New Testament?

Scenes in the Temple.

It opens with a scene in the Temple, where Zacharias was executing the priest's office, and "the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of incense." And the angel Gabriel standing at the right side of the Altar appeared to him with a message from God, that he was to be the medium through which the Saviour should be ushered into the world.

S. Luke incidentally notices the relationship of the priest's wife, Elizabeth, to the Mother of the Lord, and not without significance, for it connects Him from His birth with the priestly race.

While S. Matthew recorded how the Wise Men came inquiring for Him Who was born "King

of the Jews," S. Luke tells how the shepherds received the announcement from the lips of the angel, "Unto you is born this day in the city of ii. 11. David a Saviour, Which is Christ the Lord."

Here we read, too, of the purification of the Blessed Virgin, and the presentation of the Holy Babe, in the Temple; and it is there that the priest, who has been long "waiting for the consolation of Israel," breaks out in his final song of praise and thanksgiving; and the reason of his joy is not that the promised King had come, but because his eyes had seen that salvation which would remove the veil from the face of the Gentiles, as well as become the glory of Israel.

Yet more, there are other lips to take up the self-same strain. We are still in the Temple while we listen to the aged Anna, the devout prophetess, with her expectations realised and her soul satisfied, giving thanks that redemption was about to be accomplished in Jerusalem.

Again, S. Luke throws open the gates of the Temple, and in the presence of the Rabbis and doctors who sat in the seat of Moses, we hear the Child Jesus, the foreordained Priest, declare that the Building in which they were assembled was the place where He was naturally to be found: "why

is it that ye sought me? how is it that you did not know where to find me? wist ye not that I must be in my Father's House?"[1]

All through these early chapters S. Luke seems so carried away with his theme of the Priesthood of Christ that he cannot tear himself from the Temple. It is remarkable, too, that after he has unfolded all that Christ did in His Priestly life, as He went in and out among the people, his thoughts go back again at the close to the same scene, and He leaves us with our eyes fixed on the Apostles who had received by delegation His priestly office "in the Temple praising and blessing God." What again is the last act which he records of our Blessed Lord?[2] Is it not His entrance into the Holy of Holies, there to appear before God as our great High Priest to make intercession for us; and has it not much significance that he passed out of sight while fulfilling a priestly function; "and He led them out as far as to Bethany, and He lifted up His hands, and blessed them"?

xxiv. 53.

Our High Priest entering the Holy of Holies.

xxiv. 50.

[1] It is so translated in the Revised Version. He might have been engaged in His "Father's business" elsewhere than in the Temple. The R.V. explains why the Blessed Virgin ought, as He says, to have known where He was.

[2] The Ascension is not mentioned by any other Evangelist, if the closing verses of S. Mark's Gospel are from another hand.

XIX.

Christ's Intercessory Office.

Prayer and intercession are duties inherent in the priestly office, and there are no pages in the Sacred History where they are so frequently shown to be exercised as in the third Gospel. It is true S. Luke says nothing of the Great Intercession, S. John xvii. "the High Priest's Prayer," at the close of His earthly ministry, but it is hardly to be wondered at. He, who lay on His bosom, and was allowed to penetrate the deepest mysteries of His Being, is the only Evangelist from whom we should expect to receive this revelation of His innermost soul. But, apart from this, S. Luke has told us more than any one of His habit of praying. When He was baptized, S. Matthew and S. Mark record the fact that the heavens were opened and that the Spirit of God descended upon Him like a dove, but S. Luke gives us the information that it was iii. 21. in answer to His prayer. Again, at the Transfiguration, the same Evangelists make no mention

The frequent notice of prayer in this Gospel.

of our Lord's prayer, but S. Luke says that "He went up into the mountain to pray," and yet further that it was "as He prayed" that "the fashion of His countenance was altered, and His raiment was white and glistering." There are other instances of the same kind of omission supplied by S. Luke. After He had cleansed the "man full of leprosy," and the fame thereof brought such crowds together that He sought for solitude in desert places; it is added in this Gospel that "He withdrew Himself into the wilderness, and prayed."

ix. 29.

S. Mark i. 45.

S. Luke v. 16.

"The Lord's Prayer" is given by S. Matthew as part of the "Sermon on the Mount"; it is omitted in S. Luke's "Sermon on the Plain," in which so much of the former is repeated; but this Evangelist records another occasion when it was enjoined; and it would seem that he selected this by preference for the very reason that it was the sight of our Lord engaged in prayer, which prompted one of His disciples to ask Him to teach them to pray.

S. Luke xi. 1.

The ordination of the Twelve Apostles is preceded by prayer only in S. Luke's narrative: "It came to pass in those days, that He went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God. And when it was day, He called

S. Matt. x. 1.
S. Mark iii. 13.
S. Luke vi. 12, 13.

unto Him His disciples: and of them He chose twelve, whom also He named Apostles."

There is a very touching episode in which S. Peter plays an important part, which illustrates most forcibly our Lord's use of intercessory prayer. After the Last Supper He said to him, "Simon, Simon, behold Satan, asked[1] to have you that he might sift you as wheat: but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not."—(R. V.) Though this refers especially to the danger of denial that was then impending, which led our Lord to use the individualising pronoun, "thee," after He had spoken of them all, it is almost impossible not to feel that there was also a distinct allusion to the historic occasion, when He determined to put the Apostles to the test concerning their conception of His Person and office, and asked, "Whom say ye that I am?" He had never before questioned them about Himself, but a momentous crisis had been reached, and the end was approaching; and Jesus, as in all the other great events of His life, betook Himself to prayer. Everything depended on the answer which should be given, and S. Luke has been careful to tell us how He withdrew Himself and was "alone praying," interceding no doubt

Our Lord's prayer for S. Peter.

S. Luke xxii. 31, 32.

ix. 18.

[1] The tense in the Greek indicates a definite time then passed.

for all, but remembering the sequel we can readily believe, especially for S. Peter, for it was he who gave immediate utterance to the great confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." At all events it has a distinct interest in connection with S. Luke's conception of Christ's priestly office, that on both occasions He interceded for His Apostle that his faith might not fail.

S. Matt. xvi. 16.

It is in exact accord with all that S. Luke has written of Him, that he should have preserved that beautiful prayer which fell from His lips as the executioners nailed Him to the Cross: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." The great High Priest was gathering up into one last petition every intercession which had ever been offered in Tabernacle or Temple—the cry for pardon, of which every prayer to be poured out in Christian churches and at Christian altars would be the echo; and we owe to S. Luke alone the knowledge that He uttered it.

xxiii. 34.

XX.

The Priest in Absolution and Pardon.

The pardon of the penitent, or absolution of sins, is another priestly function; and nowhere is the exercise of it more conspicuous than in this Gospel. Some allusions to it are common both to this and another Gospel: such, for instance, as the parable of the lost sheep, or the declaration that "They that are whole[1] need not a physician, but they that are sick" in immediate connection with Levi's renunciation of his sinful calling; but the following are peculiar to S. Luke, the assurance of the joy of the angels over the repentant sinner, the parable of the lost piece of money, the announcement to Zacchæus, on receiving full proof of his penitence, "This day is salvation come to this house," and the promise of pardon to the conscience-

The message of pardon emphasised by S. Luke.

xv. 4. S. Matt. xviii. 12.

v. 31. S. Matt. ix. 12.

xv. 7, 10.

xix. 9.

[1] S. Matthew and S. Mark write οἱ ἰσχύοντες, "those that were strong," but S. Luke uses the medical term, "those who are in good health." In the healing of the centurion's servant, it is said, they found him "whole," ὑγιαίνοντα, not only healed, but "in good health."

stricken malefactor pleading to be remembered in
xxiii. 43. the future kingdom of the Lord, "To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise."

It will be well, however, to illustrate it more fully by the consideration of one of our Lord's miracles and parables, and one striking event belonging to this Gospel and this alone.

The cleansing and absolution of lepers.

Let us take the cleansing of the leper, because leprosy, inasmuch as it was the direst physical disease and the culmination of misery, has always been regarded emphatically as the type of sin, and the discharge by the Jewish priest after the leper was cleansed foreshadowed the absolution which is pronounced on the sinner by the Christian priest. Now S. Matthew and S. Mark share with S. Luke the record of the cure of one man "full of leprosy,"[1] but it was reserved for the last exclusively to tell of that wonderful miracle which set free no less
xvii. 12. than ten lepers by a single word. It is a further proof of the all-embracing character of the atonement, and the universality of Christ's Priesthood, that the leper, to whom He imparted His highest blessing, was a Samaritan, a stranger to the cove-

[1] This is another strictly medical expression, distinguishing a special form of the disease. The ancient doctors mention three kinds of leprosy.

nant of promise, an alien from the commonwealth of Israel.

There is also a very striking parable which, from its vivid enforcement of the tremendous power of pardoning mercy, has been called "the pearl and crown of all the parables of Scripture." It is not too much to say that the story of the Prodigal Son has been more instrumental in bringing sinners to the feet of Him "Whose nature and property is ever to have mercy, and to forgive," than anything else that was ever written. Nowhere can we learn so well the true spirit of confession as in the contrite acknowledgment, "I have sinned against heaven and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son"; and from no other utterance can we gather more clearly the complete absolution of the penitent, "This thy brother was dead, and is alive again; and was lost, and is found."

xv. 11.

The pardon of the Prodigal Son.

Then we have the same truths inculcated in actual history in an incident of surpassing beauty and interest. Our Lord had gone to be a guest in the house of Simon the Pharisee. During the feast "a woman in the city which was a sinner," stirred, no doubt, by words which had fallen from His lips as He taught the people, to abandon her life of sin and shame, stole in from the open court

The penitent woman that was a sinner.

and came and stood behind Him at the table "weeping, and began to wash His feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment." There was no open audible confession of sin, but there are times when deeds are more eloquent than words, and the great Absolver read the secrets of a heart too full to speak, and gave
vii. 47, 48. her the pardon she craved: to Simon He said, "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little." And to her He said, "Thy sins are forgiven." He had proved to Simon that she had fulfilled all the conditions which are expected of the penitent, and He gave her absolution.

XXI.

Priestly Attributes of Sympathy, Compassion, and Mercy.

All of these attributes are inherent in the priestly office, and all have a prominent place in S. Luke's Gospel. They underlie the acts of pardon and forgiveness on which we have already written; but they stand out clear and conspicuous in some other of our Lord's deeds and utterances. The sympathy that is touched with a sense of human sorrow is especially manifested in the raising of the widow's son at Nain. It was the bitterness of the deepest mourning, the mourning for an "only son," enhanced by the loneliness of widowhood, which called forth His fullest pity and desire to afford consolation and relief: "when the Lord saw her, He had compassion on her, and said unto her, Weep not." Again, when He had called the young man back to life, it was an act of most touching sympathy that He took him by the hand, "and delivered him to his mother."

Sympathy with the widow of Nain. vii. 11.

So, when He drew near and beheld the city, all His human sympathy and compassion came welling up in tears of sorrow for its impending fate: "He wept over it."

xix. 41.

Once more we witness the same tender and compassionate feeling for the women of Jerusalem, whom He met on the way of the Cross. Entering by anticipation into all that awaited them of trial and misery, even when fresh Himself from the presence of Pilate and the mocking and scourging and spitting, to which He had been subjected, He forgot it all in His deep sympathy and pitiful sorrow, "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children."

xxiii. 28.

Pity for the women on the Via Crucis.

Then look at mercy. Can anything express more fully the estimate which S. Luke put upon this attribute than the interpretation which He gives of the ideal completeness of man's being? In "the Sermon on the Mount" our Lord concluded His exhortation on the love of our neighbour with the appeal to His hearers to strive to reach the highest standard of the Divine life: "Be ye[1]

The high estimate formed of mercy.

S. Matt. v. 48.

[1] "Ye therefore shall be perfect" (R. V.). If we so translate it, our Lord instead of appealing to them to attain to perfection, promises them that if they do as He had enjoined them, if they would be merciful, they would be as their Father, *i.e.* perfect. In S. Matthew the reading is ἔσεσθε, but in S. Luke γίνεσθε.

therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

In the Sermon on the Plain, in precisely the same connection, S. Luke sums up His teaching with the words: "Be ye, therefore, merciful, as your Father is also merciful." There is no contradiction: that quality of mercy, which "is mightiest in the mightiest," which receives its highest exemplification in God Himself, is a synonym of perfection. It makes little difference whether we suppose that our Lord Himself, Who brought out of His treasury things new and old, had varied the form of His appeal, or that S. Luke was guided by the Holy Spirit to express His teaching in a more concrete form. In the light of the Atonement upon which this Evangelist's thoughts were fixed, based as it was like all sacrifice upon the principle of mercy, he felt that one who had attained to the highest reach of this Divine attribute could attain nothing higher: he would be "perfect" as his Father was perfect.

vi. 36.

XXII.

The Sacrificial Character of the Eucharist.

THE record which S. Luke has left of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist illustrates very forcibly the main purpose of his Gospel, which was to emphasise the sacrificial side of Christ's work. There are three accounts in the Gospels; and in all it is associated with sacrifice, but especially in the third. The sacrifice of the Cross gathered into itself all the features of the sacrificial system which preceded and foreshadowed it. There was therefore a strong presumption that the Service, ordained by Christ to commemorate it, would have at least some corresponding feature, the basis of continuity between the Old and New Dispensations seeming to necessitate it. It is further borne out by the fact that it was instituted at a sacrificial time and in sacrificial language. S. Matthew and S. Mark dwelt upon points which recalled the sacrifice of the Passover; the Body broken, taken and eaten, would suggest at once to a Jew that our

S. Luke's language on the Institution of the Eucharist especially sacrificial.

Lord was speaking of a "Feast upon a Sacrifice"; as S. Paul says, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the Feast." The Passover in which the disciples were engaged was the chief of the sacrifices of Peace-offering, and the eating of the Body of Christ corresponded to the eating of the Lamb after it had been offered in the Temple. Now the participation of the victim involved two ideas: not only fellowship with each other on the part of those who shared the Feast, but especially fellowship with the Giver of the Feast. To eat of a sacrifice offered to idols carried with it of necessity the idea of fellowship with the idol; so, S. Paul argued by analogy, it is with those who partake of the Lord's Table. After the victim had been offered, it belonged exclusively to God; but He gave it back by the hand of the priest, and it became to the people a pledge of their friendship and peace with Him. Even so in the Holy Eucharist, Christ by His action and words implied that His Body, offered to God and broken in sacrifice, is given back from the Altar, or "God's Board," and this is the Feast upon the Sacrifice.

1 Cor. v. 7, 8.

Not only a Feast upon a Sacrifice.

1 Cor. x. 20, 21.

This is one special feature of the Eucharist to which prominence is given by S. Matthew and

S. Mark. S. Luke introduces a further sacrificial feature, and herein he agrees very closely with S. Paul. It is not possible to say whether they both drew upon some older traditional account than the other Evangelists, or whether, as is most probable, S. Paul gave the information to his friend and companion. If so, it adds weight to S. Luke's addition; for S. Paul prefaces his account of the Institution with the assurance that what he declared, he had "received of the Lord." The knowledge was supernaturally revealed to him, and as such he would communicate it. This is what S. Luke adds, "This do in remembrance of Me";[1] "This do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me"; the special significance, however, is lost in the English Version. Perhaps its fulness of meaning might be expressed thus: "offer" or "celebrate this as My memorial." The sacrificial act or "memorial" (*anamnesis*) consists in the doing of what Christ commanded to be done, and the saying after Him of what He said; and the very word that

The full meaning of "in remembrance of Me."

1 Cor. xi. 23.

[1] τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. ἀνάμνησις in Hellenic Greek is always sacrificial: ποιεῖν is the same about fifty times. Cf. Exod. xxix. 36, 39; Lev. iv. 20, ix. 7; Ps. lxvi. 15, etc. The presumption therefore is that when brought together thus, both are used sacrificially, even though the use of one is more frequently than not non-sacrificial.

Christ used is in the Greek of the Old Testament restricted to what is done "before God"; it was intended, then, to remind God of His Sacrificial Death. It is sometimes felt to be a difficulty in so interpreting Christ's command, that God knows the Sacrifice of His Son perfectly and has no need to have it put before Him in any memorial. God has answered this objection completely; He made a covenant with Noah after the Flood and gave him an assurance that he would keep it. He did not, however, say that any memorial of His promise was unnecessary, but the reverse; for God does nothing in vain, and this is what He said, "I do set My bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between Me and the earth . . . and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth." Gen. ix. 13-16.

In the Old Testament *anamnesis* is used of the sacrifices of Peace-offerings "for a memorial before your God." Again, in laying out the Shewbread the direction is, "thou shalt put pure frankincense upon each row, that it may be on the bread for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto the Lord." When a memorial before men, which is not sacrificial, is spoken of, another word (*mnemosunon*) Numb. x. 10. Lev. xxiv. 7.

Numb. xvi. 40. Josh. iv. 7.

is employed, as with Korah's brazen censers, and the twelve stones set up in the Jordan, where it is stated that they were to be a memorial "unto the children of Israel."

Christ's present pleading in heaven.

Now in order to understand how the Holy Eucharist is a "memorial before God," we must realise first what Christ Himself is doing in heaven, and how His action is related to the offering of the Holy Eucharist. Christ in heaven is exercising a perpetual Priesthood, for it is said, "He is a Priest for ever," and as a Priest, He must have "somewhat to offer." His offering is the presentation before the Father of the "memorial" of His own "full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice," by which He pleads for the forgiveness of men's sins.

Heb. v. 1; viii. 3.

His priests on earth are doing the same.

Now what He is doing in heaven in one way, He is doing on earth in another; above, in His own Person, by Himself unveiled, below by delegation under the veil of an earthly priesthood; the offering in both cases is precisely the same, the "memorial," *anamnesis*, before God of the one finished Sacrifice for sin.

Worthy Communicant.

Jeremy Taylor has gathered it all up into a single sentence: "What Christ does in heaven He hath commanded us to do on earth, that is, to represent His Death, to commemorate His Sacrifice

by humble prayer and thankful record, and by faithful manifestation and joyful Eucharist to lay it before the eyes of the heavenly Father."

When we consider all this we can have no manner of doubt that it is another and important link in the chain of evidence for the main purpose of S. Luke's Gospel, that in his account of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist he laid stress upon words which were intended to emphasise its sacrificial character.

We have, therefore, no hesitation in concluding that the calf or ox, as an important victim in the Jewish system of sacrifice, has been rightly appropriated as an emblem to S. Luke; and though we might conclude from the other Gospels that Christ, as the antitype, gathered up and consummated all the ancient sacrifices into His own Sacrifice upon the Cross, and that He instituted the Eucharist as a Feast upon His Sacrifice, it is from S. Luke, alone of the Evangelists, that we learn Christ's further intention to make in it a sacrificial "memorial before God."

S. John

πρόσωπον ἀετοῦ.

ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πληρῶμα θεότητος

σωματικῶς.

καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος.

XXIII.

The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

NEARLY thirty years ago, in a conversation with Professor Lightfoot at Cambridge on the hostile criticisms of the New Testament, he said, "I have long felt that the decisive battle of Christianity will be fought over S. John's Gospel. In expectation of this the book occupied much of my studies, and I trust, when the crisis comes, that I may be able to produce convincing evidence that S. John and no one else was its author." Very shortly afterwards he published the first fruits of his labours in a crushing reply to "Supernatural Religion,"[1] the anonymous author of which had concluded his examination of this Gospel with the not over-modest claim, that he had said "enough to show that the testimony of the fourth Gospel is of no value towards establishing the truth of miracles and the reality of Divine Revelation."[2]

The paramount importance of maintaining the Apostolic Authorship.

[1] *An Inquiry into the Reality of Divine Revelation* in 2 vols., published anonymously in 1874. Professor Lightfoot replied by a series of articles in the *Contemporary Review*, 1874-75.

[2] Vol. ii. p. 476.

In 1880 this was supplemented by an Introduction to S. John's Gospel in the *Speaker's Commentary*, by his colleague in the Professoriate, Dr. Westcott, which has been characterised as "a supreme vindication both of the credibility of the Gospel, and of its authorship by S. John himself." To those who desire to inquire into the evidence at length, the subjoined list of writers [1] will supply ample materials for forming a judgment. Such an investigation, save into the arguments which are drawn from the internal phenomena of the Gospel, would be foreign to our purpose. Inasmuch as these supply some "special characteristics," we enter, though of necessity very briefly, upon their consideration.

The Author a Palestinian Jew.

The unnamed [2] author of the Gospel writes as one who was perfectly "at home" in Palestine and among its inhabitants; in his description of places

[1] An American writer, Gaspar Gregory, estimated the works and treatises touching the authenticity of this Gospel issued from the press between 1792-1875 at 491. Against it, perhaps, the best known of the earlier works is the *Probabilia de Evangelii et Epistolarum Johannis Origine.* The most famous authors on the same side are continental—Strauss, Baur, Schenkel, Keim, Renan; and the author of *Supernatural Religion* in England.

In favour of it—Lange, Schleiermacher, Tholuck, Godet, Ebrard, and Olshausen: and in this country a weighty number—Lightfoot, Westcott, Liddon, Sanday, Abbot, Alford, and Wordsworth.

[2] S. John is not once mentioned directly by name in the Gospel.

and explanation of customs, he manifests the artless simplicity of one who, as a native, knew every detail of the landscape, and could give the precise reasons for the ways and habits peculiar to the people. Thus, Bethany (Bethabara of A. V.) is "beyond Jordan"; Ænon was near to Salim and i. 28.
had "many springs";[1] Sychar is "near to the parcel iii. 23.
of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph"; iv. 5.
"Bethany (the city of Lazarus) was nigh unto xi. 18.
Jerusalem, about fifteen furlongs off." Again, he knew the topography as well as the geography of what he described; "Jacob's well was there," and iv. 6, 11.
"the well is deep"; the pool of Bethesda, with its five porches, was "by the sheep-market," or more probably "sheep-gate";[2] "Jesus was not yet come v. 2.
into the town, but was in that place where Martha xi. 30.
met Him"; lastly, he was familiar with the inside of Pilate's Judgment Hall, where the seat was placed on a tesselated "pavement" called in the xix. 13.
Hebrew or Aramaic "Gabbatha."

Notice, again, his familiarity with the customs of the people of Palestine: at the Marriage Feast waterpots were placed "after the manner of the

[1] Cf. *infra*, p. 229.

[2] ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ, scil. πύλῃ. Cf. "the sheep-gate," Nehem. iii. 32, xii. 39.

ii. 6. purifying of the Jews," and they were of "stone,"
Chelim x. 1. Shabbath, 77. x. 22-24. as the Talmud enjoined for washings before and after meals; of their habit of walking between the
Josephus, Antiq. xx. ix. 7. services during the winter in Solomon's cloister; it was on the East and caught the morning sun. Quite incidentally he mentions how scrupulous the
xviii. 28. Maimonides, Hilechoth, Chametz Umattzah, ii. 1-3. people were about ceremonial defilement: "they themselves went not into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled";[1] lastly, he gives the reason why the Jews wanted Pilate to have the bodies of the crucified quickly removed, that they "should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath
xix. 31. day, because it was the preparation," and "that sabbath day was an high day."[2]

The prominence given to Jewish Feasts will be pointed out later, when we compare this history of our Lord's ministry with that of the other Evangelists.

The Author's acquaintance with the Jewish Scriptures is shown by the fact that his quotations from them are almost as frequent as they are in the first Gospel, and sometimes from the Hebrew

[1] There would be leaven under a heathen roof: whereas they "put it away" with the utmost care according to their law before the Passover began. Cf. *Footprints*, lxiii.

[2] The Roman custom was to leave the body on the cross for some time.

text rather than from the LXX. Version.[1] But enough has been said to establish his nationality.

The author an eye-witness.

We advance another step to prove that he was an eye-witness of what he describes; sometimes we may gather it from expressions which suggest that he was present, sometimes from his deliberate assurances. Under the former head we read, "John was standing (R. V.): and he looked upon Jesus as He walked"; "then Jesus turned and saw them following"; "being wearied with His journey He sat thus on the well"; "and as Jesus passed by He saw a man which was blind"; "he went his way therefore, and washed, and came seeing"; "the napkin, that was about His Head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself"; "on this wise shewed He Himself." These are but a few specimens of a great number of descriptions which almost establish the conviction that he had seen with his own eyes what he puts before us.

i. 35-8. iv. 6. ix. 1, 7. xx. 7. xxi. 1.

Under the latter class we place three definite assertions, which we shall comment upon in the proper place, the first, his witness of the Transfiguration: "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt

i. 14.

[1] From Ps. xli. 9 (Heb. xl.), Zech. xii. 10, Isa. vi. 9, 10 compare S. Matt. xiii. 14.

among us (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only Begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth." The second, of the piercing of the
xix. 35. side of the Crucified: "and straightway came there out blood and water; and he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true" (R. V.). The third passage is found in the Epilogue with which the Gospel closes. There is something in the language[1] which has led to the conjecture that it was written by other hands: but even if it were an addition of the Ephesian Elders, anxious to correct a false impression about S. John's expected immunity from death, it must have been added with the author's sanction, and it contains the distinct declaration that the disciple "which beareth witness of these things" is he who "wrote these things."

All this leaves little room for doubt that the

[1] Bishop Westcott holds that xxi. 1-23 is of the nature of an Appendix, that S. John originally intended to close the Gospel after xx. 30, but he says there is no evidence to show that the Gospel was ever published without it. He thinks, however, that the last two verses 24, 25 were by another hand, and argues from the change of person from "we know" to "I suppose" that there was a change of author; but this very change frequently occurs in his Epistles, cf. I. i. 1, "That which we have heard," and I. ii. 1, "These things write I unto you." Cf. also vv. 3 and 7, and there are others.

Gospel was written by an eye-witness, whoever he may have been.[1]

Further, it was written by one who must have been admitted to a very close relationship with our Lord, and was able to see more than others of His inner life; His feelings, emotions, motives, and the working of His mind; Jesus "did not commit Himself unto them, because He knew all men. . . . He knew what was in man"; "when Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take Him by force, to make Him a king, He departed again into a mountain Himself alone"; "when Jesus knew in Himself that His disciples murmured at it, He said unto them, Doth this offend you?" "Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray Him; and He said, Therefore said I." "Now Jesus knew that they were desirous to ask Him"; "Jesus therefore, knowing all things that should come upon Him, went forth"; and lastly, "After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst."

An intimate friend of our Lord.

ii. 24, 25.

vi. 15.

vi. 61, 64.

xvi. 19.

xviii. 4.

xix. 28.

Now let us see from the life and history of

[1] Bishop Lightfoot wrote in 1890, "Additional study has only strengthened my conviction that this narrative of S. John could not have been written by any one but an eye-witness."—*Expositor.*

S. John how far he fulfils the conditions of authorship here laid down. By birth and nationality, by his calling and friendship with Jesus, he had every qualification for the purpose. Both his parents were Jews—Zebedee, a fisherman in good circumstances, for he had "hired servants," Salome, sister of the Blessed Virgin, and like her husband above the condition of poverty, for she was one of those who "ministered to Him of their substance," and the family was on terms of intimacy with the High Priest.[1] They were, moreover, Palestinian Jews, and their son grew up on the shores of the Lake of Tiberias, for they probably lived at Bethsaida, and knew all the localities associated with our Lord's ministry. As a Jew, again, he must have learned the Old Testament Scriptures, and been instructed in the precepts of the Mishnah and in the customs, the hopes, and pious language of the people; for he eagerly embraced the Baptist's message, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

S. John a Jew, brought up in Palestine.

S. Luke viii. 3.

i. 29.

Further, he was called to the Apostleship, and took part with our Lord in most of the scenes

Also an Apostle.

[1] It is stated that John was, but it must have been a family friendship, for it was not likely to have originated after he became an Apostle.

which are described in the Gospel, and as one of the inner circle, the chosen three, he was privileged to witness great and transcendent events, some of which the author of the Gospel claims to have seen: viz., the Transfiguration, the raising of Jairus's daughter, the agony in Gethsemane, and the Crucifixion. Yet more, he had the most enviable distinction of all, for he was "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and at the Last Supper was privileged to recline with his head upon his Master's bosom; from which he gained in after time the unique and beautiful designation—ὁ ἐπιστήθιος[1]—"the one upon the breast." He alone of the disciples stood beneath the Cross, and he received the unspeakable honour of receiving from His Dying Lord the charge of His Mother, so that he should be to her in the place of a son. This bespeaks the fullest confidence. Who, then, was more likely to be allowed to read the secrets or interpret the motives of our Lord than one so favoured and trusted?

The beloved disciple.

Then there is the positive evidence of the writer of the Gospel, or at least a part of it, that he was none other than "he whom Jesus loved," "which

[1] Suicer says, Quoniam Joannes dicitur recubuisse ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ et ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (S. John xiii. 23, 25) propterea a veteribus satis frequenter appellatur, ἐπιστήθιος; and he gives a number of references.

also leaned on his breast at supper." When, then, every other of the above considerations is in favour of the conclusion, this last may well be called in to seal the evidence and inspire us with confidence in the Apostolic Authorship of the Fourth Gospel.[1]

[1] Even Ewald, with all his unorthodox views, was unable to resist the evidence in favour of S. John's authorship. Canon Liddon in his Bampton Lectures quoted his remarkable conclusion: "No one who does not will knowingly to choose error and to reject truth, can dare to say that the fourth Gospel is not the work of the Apostle John."

XXIV.

Traditional Testimony to the Character of the Author.

AFTER the Ascension there can be little doubt that S. John remained at Jerusalem. The charge of the Master to take care of the Blessed Virgin, given under circumstances of the deepest solemnity, must have been held as of paramount obligation; and it is universally believed that, till she died, he watched over her in his own house. The date of her death is nowhere recorded; but when he was free to take up his missionary work, he passed into Asia, and became Bishop of Ephesus. Persecution broke out and drove him into exile and imprisonment in the mines at Patmos, where his sojourn is the only certain historic event for the rest of his life: "I was," he writes at the opening of the Revelation, "in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus Christ."

S. John remained at Jerusalem after the Ascension.

Rev. i. 9.

If, however, history is silent or at least very uncertain in what it says about him and the sphere

of his labours in later life, there are abundant traditions and legends; and though it is not easy to separate the true from the false in all cases, there are not a few which deserve and have always received unhesitating acceptance. Of these, we dwell only upon such as are obviously consistent with his character, or derive any support from the Gospel.

The first tradition witnesses to his zeal.

The first has come down to us on the authority of his chief and beloved pupil, Polycarp, the Bishop and Martyr of Smyrna. He was a man of whom Eusebius testified that "he taught only what he had learned from the Apostles, or the Church had handed down"; and this is the story received from him and preserved by the historian: "There are those still living, who heard him relate that John the disciple of the Lord went into a bath at Ephesus, and seeing Cerinthus there, ran out without bathing and exclaimed, "Let us flee, lest the bath should fall in, as long as Cerinthus, that enemy of truth, is within"; and he repeats the same in another part of his *History*.

Eccles. Hist. iv. xiv.

Views of Cerinthus.

Cerinthus was the great heresiarch of the later Apostolic Age, who not only held Millennial views of a gross and sensual kind, which were most repugnant to the pure mind of the Apostle, but

struck at the very root of Christ's Divinity by insisting that He was born of Joseph and Mary after the manner of men, and that the illapse of the Word at His Baptism was only temporary. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. iii. xxviii., vii. xxv.

This sudden outburst of the Apostle's indignation recalls the fiery zeal, which won for him the designation, "a son of thunder"; but it was almost the last trace of his passionate nature which was "melting away in the softening light of growing perfection," for throughout his Gospel, written, as it was, in the main to uphold the doctrine impugned by Cerinthus, there is nothing but the calm and deliberate argument of one who would persuade rather than overawe and terrify. We fancy we can see him, while he wrote, at each successive unveiling of the Divine nature, checking the passion of his old experience, and satisfying himself that the irresistible force of our Lord's own claims[1] would compel their acceptance. Iren. iii. xi. 1. How his zeal was tempered.

The second traditional story is almost equally characteristic of his impetuosity and eagerness in the cause of right, and is combined with a striking manifestation of that over-mastering love which is the dominant passion throughout his Gospel. Clement of Alexandria set such store by the Witness to his over-mastering love.

[1] *Infra*, ch. xxx.

narrative, that he prefaced his account by the assertion that it "was no fiction but history." He tells how S. John, after his deliverance from prison at Patmos, resumed his Episcopal office, and at a pastoral visit to Ephesus commended to a newly consecrated bishop a youth of much promise, in the hope that he would be trained for the service of the Church; but he was neglected, and eventually became the captain of a band of brigands, who infested some of the wilder parts of Asia.[1] After some lapse of time the Apostle inquired concerning his welfare from the guardian with whom he had left him, and received the sorrowful answer: "He is dead: dead to God: he has turned out wicked and abandoned and at last a robber." On hearing this, S. John, with great lamentation replied, "He was a fine keeper with whom I left a brother's soul! Let a horse at once be fetched and some one to guide me to the place where he lives. Coming to the country, he was taken prisoner by the outpost of the banditti, and demanded to be conducted to their captain; as soon as he came into his presence, the robber-chief was overcome with shame and tried to escape; but the Apostle

Euseb. Eccl. Hist. iii. 23.

His recovery of the robber-chief.

[1] Their chief strongholds were in Cilicia, but they extended to much of the coast-land. Appian, *Bell. Mithr.* c. 92.

pursued after him, and pleaded with passionate entreaty that he would return and repent, offering, if need be, to lay down his life for his safety; and in the end the sinner was restored to the Church." [1]

Like the previous legend it reflects the true spirit of love which is a keynote of the Gospel; but it has an additional interest, for it shows how the Evangelist tried in every particular to imitate the Good Shepherd, of whom he alone has left us the picture; not fleeing like the hireling in the face of danger, but knowing his lost sheep and known by him, and ready even to lay down his life for his recovery. Upon the third we need not linger long, for it does but repeat, albeit with increased force, the lesson of the last, and shows how the dominant principle of his life became the all-absorbing influence of his dying days. S. Jerome tells us that when all capacity for work was gone, when strength even to walk had failed, the spirit of love triumphed over all his failing infirmities, and, as he was carried about through the Christian assemblies, he repeated with no change or variation his Master's command, "Little children, love one another."

Hieron. in Gal. vi.

The force of love triumphing over all infirmities.

[1] This is a curtailed account, but gives the chief points of interest, and I have marked it in consequence as a quotation.

Can we possibly read the story, and not feel how the spring and motive of this the last act of his life lay in the new commandment, which followed the washing of the disciples' feet, recorded only by S. John, "Little children . . . a new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another"?

S. John xiii. 33-35.

There are other legends of far less historic value, but full of interest as showing how the prolongation of S. John's life in combination with our Lord's declaration to S. Peter, "if I will that he tarry till I come," conjured up, in the minds of his own and succeeding generations, a strong belief in his inconquerable vitality that "he should never die."

S. John xxi. 22. Legends of the Apostle's indestructible life.

The first of these stories must have arisen during his lifetime,[1] and was not silenced, though contradicted by fact, for many centuries; as it lingered on into the Middle Ages,[2] and is still commemorated in a modified form in the Greek Church[3] by the Feast

[1] Some writers hold that chapter xxi. was an appendix to the Gospel, and that verse 23 was inserted still later to correct the belief that had spread about on his expected immunity from death.

[2] Nicephorus, *Eccl. Hist.* ii. 42.

[3] It occurs in the Menologium Græcum. The belief of the Greek Church was, that if he died he underwent no change, but

of the Translation of S. John's body. S. Augustine's notice of it, especially as in part supported by credible witnesses, no doubt, contributed much to its later acceptance. This is what he says: "They have a tradition how he ordered a Sepulchre to be made for him, being at the time in perfect health; and how, when this had been dug and most carefully prepared, he laid himself therein as in a bed and straightway gave up the ghost; howbeit, as those suppose, who take the words of the Lord in this meaning, he did not actually die, but lay like one deceased; and being thought to be dead, was buried asleep; and so remains until Christ come, giving tokens the while of his being alive, by the heaving of the dust; which dust is supposed to be stirred by the breathing of the sleeper, so as to rise from beneath the surface of the grave. I think it superfluous to combat this opinion. Be it for them who know the spot, to see whether the earth in that place does this, or is thus affected, as they say; as in fact we have been told this by men of no slight authority."

S. Aug. Tract. in Johann. cxxiv.

There can hardly be a doubt that two other

ascended in bodily form to heaven to rejoin Christ and the Blessed Virgin. Cf. Mrs. Jameson, *Sacred and Legendary Art*, i. 169. Also Stanley's Traditions respecting S. John, in *Essays on the Apostolic Age*, p. 277.

Other legends confirm the belief.

familiar legends grew out of this popular belief that the Apostle could not die, and have no historical value. Unlike the other, however, they owe their popularity mainly to Christian Art. The first, and best known in the English Church, from its commemoration on May 6th in our Calendar, is that which represents him as emerging unscathed from the caldron of boiling oil into which he had been plunged by order of the Emperor Domitian. Perhaps the most familiar painting of it is that by Rubens in his Altar-Piece at Malines. There is also a striking woodcut by Albert Dürer, representing the scene with much of his characteristic and vigorous force. This supposed martyrdom in will has given him the right to bear a palm.

Tertull. de Præscr. Hær. xxxvi.

Hieron. in Matt. xx. 23.

The second describes his escape from death after drinking a poisoned draught; but whether it was given to him at the instigation of the Emperor, or in the Chalice, as a test of the truth of his mission, traditions vary. In Art he lifts his hand in benediction, and the serpent is seen issuing from the cup.

The value of such traditions.

Now the purpose for which we have enumerated these stories, which took such hold upon the minds of the early Christians, is not only that they

confirm us in our estimate of this Apostle's personal characteristics, gained from Holy Scripture, but that they contribute also to the arguments for his identification with the Author of the Fourth Gospel. Some of them illustrate in a very striking manner the most beautiful principles, which breathe through all its pages; while others afford convincing proof that at least the men of his own generation believed, without a shadow of doubt, that it had been written by him and none other.

XXV.

S. John preserves the History of our Lord's Ministry at Jerusalem.

THERE is one general characteristic feature of the Fourth Gospel, which may be summed up in a single word, viz., the contrast it presents to the Synoptic Gospels. This is found in regard to our Lord's history and Person; both where He went during His Earthly Ministry, what He did, and how He taught; and also what He was. We do not mean that there is any contradiction or discrepancy; only that for special reasons, created by the differing circumstances of the writers, both the history and Personality are viewed in different lights. A gulf of at least thirty years separated them from each other; and those were years of tremendous change and development. When S. John set himself to write his Gospel, the works of the other three had, no doubt, attained a wide circulation, and he must have been quite familiar with their contents. He would be able, there-

S. John's view of our Lord's History and Person.

fore, to recognise where their history required to be supplemented.[1] During the interval, too, as "the Apostle of contemplation" he had time to meditate in reverential study upon the Person, with Whom he had been privileged to hold such close communion for the three years of His Ministry; and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, bringing all things to his remembrance and quickening his intelligence, he must have realised even more and more of the full meaning of what he had heard and seen.

Let us notice, first, how he supplemented the history. Broadly speaking he did it by developing the Judæan Ministry; the other Evangelists had made their records of Christ's Life and Work circle round the sea of Galilee; they do not describe His Presence in Judæa till the Last Passover, when He goes up to Jerusalem to suffer and die. S. John, on the other hand, makes the Holy City and its surroundings the chief centre of His activity. There is no contradiction between them; for though the Synoptists dwelt solely upon

He supplemented the existing histories.

[1] The Apostle John, it is said, being requested to undertake it (*i.e.* the history of His early labours) with the account of the time not recorded by the former Evangelists and the deeds done by the Saviour, which they have passed by.—Euseb. iii. xxiv. Bags. tr. pp. 126-127, qu. by Ellicott, *Comm. in loco.*

S. Matt. xix. 1; xxiii. 37-39. S. Luke x. 38. ii. 12; iv. 43, 54; v. 1; vi. 1; vii. 1.

the one, they said nothing to exclude the other; indeed there are indirect allusions which clearly imply it. So in S. John there are frequent references[1] to His work in Galilee.

Our Lord's attendance at Jewish Feasts.

Now in the account which S. John gives we find notice of our Lord's attendance at the Feasts, to which we have alluded previously as a sign of the author's nationality; we now regard them as indicating the sphere of His Ministry. He was present five times at a Feast of the Jews according to S. John, twice at the Passover, once at the "Dedication," twice at unnamed Feasts; the first, quite at the commencement, for it seems to follow almost immediately upon the miracle at Cana of Galilee, which Jesus wrought as "the beginning[2] of His miracles." "And the Jews' Passover was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." This was the occasion upon which He cleansed the Temple for the first time. Critics have tried to show that the narrative has been displaced, and really belongs to the Last Passover, being identical with that, of which the other Evangelists write; but apart from the improbability of such confusion, there are very significant differ-

His First Passover, ii. 13.

Strauss, Neander, Lucke.

[1] i. 43; iv. 43-54; v. 1; vii. 1; x. 40; xi. 7, 8.

[2] *ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων*; *ἀρχὴν* without the def. art. is the predicate.

ences in the accounts of one and the other. S. John makes no mention of the expulsion of the buyers and sellers,[1] only of the cattle, and he says that the base traffickers were denounced for making God's House a "house of merchandise";[2] in the second purification, it is the men upon whom Christ's anger and indignation falls; He drives them out of the Temple because they have made it "a den of thieves," or rather like a cave of brigands wrangling over their spoil. This increased severity was due to their neglect of His previous displeasure and remonstrance.

The second occasion when Jesus went up to Jerusalem was to keep a Feast of less importance; S. John does not give its name; "After this there was a Feast of the Jews; and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." Without the definite article, it could hardly have been the Passover. Many writers have supposed that it was Purim, which was kept in March,[3] and S. John says in the next chapter

The Feast of Purim.

v. 1.

vi. 4.

Kepler, Stier, Neander, and many modern commentators.

[1] The A. V. is misleading. *πάντας ἐξέβαλεν. . . . τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας*, all, *i.e.* both sheep and oxen.

[2] *οἶκον ἐμπορίου.* In the Synoptist Gospels, *σπήλαιον λῃστῶν*: *κλέπτης* is a thief: *λῃστής* is one who plunders, a highwayman, or brigand. It illustrates our Lord's way of dealing with transgressors: gentle at first, severe afterwards, if gentleness fails.

[3] 14th and 15th of Adar, almost immediately before the Passover.

"the Passover was nigh"; therefore the time is suitable; it was a great commemoration of a national deliverance, in which our Lord was not unlikely to show sympathy with His countrymen.

Or the Feast of Trumpets.

Bishop Westcott, however, thinks that the Feast of Trumpets[1] more fully satisfies the conditions required, especially as the character of our Lord's teaching is in harmony with the thoughts of this Festival; but the season involves serious difficulty.

Feast of Tabernacles. vii. 10.

The next Feast which Jesus attended was that of Tabernacles; "when His brethren were gone up, then went He also up unto the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret." The Jews had come to regard this as the greatest of their Festivals, and it was, as Josephus says, a Festival "very much observed among the Jews," and was celebrated with so much feasting and external marks of joy and exaltation, that it became a proverbial saying: "he, who has not taken part in the pouring out of the water of Siloam,[2] has never seen rejoicing in his life." Possibly it was because of its character for material festivity rather than spiritual joy, that our Lord did not go up so much to take part in it Himself, as to embrace the opportunity of

Antiq. xv. iii. 3.

Succah. v. 1.

[1] In September, shortly before the day of Atonement.

[2] *i.e.* on seven days during this Feast.

teaching the people. There can be little doubt that it was the Feast of Tabernacles, for there are two or three circumstances to which Christ indirectly refers, which are intimately associated with it. He was aware of the intention of the people to put Him to death, and took occasion, as He so often did, from what He saw or heard, to reason with them. Their custom[1] was to read "the Law" at the Feast; in the very first section of it was written the command, "Thou shalt not kill." They had shewn their regard to Moses by coming up to the Feast; but they did not hearken to another of his precepts, for they were ready and eager at the same time to "do murder." "Did not Moses give you the Law—the Law which you have been listening to—and yet none of you keepeth the Law? Why go ye about to kill Me?"

Deut. xxxi. 10, 11. v.-vi. 3.

The reading of the Mosaic Law.

vii. 19.

The second allusion is to that part of the ritual of the Feast, so much honoured in its observance, in which for seven days water was brought in solemn procession from the pool of Siloam and poured out at the foot of the Altar. It was regarded by the Jews as symbolical of the water supplied from the rock in Horeb; and during the

The drawing of water from Siloam.

[1] It was directed especially for the Sabbatical year, which it is calculated this was.

ceremony they used to read the prophecy of Isaiah which told them that one day they should "with
Isa. xii. 3. joy draw water out of the wells of salvation." When the ceremony was over, for it was discontinued on "the last, the great day of the Feast," [1] Jesus told them that now the prophecy was about to receive
vii. 37-8. its fulfilment: "If any man thirst, let him come unto Me, and drink. He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water."

viii. 12, 20. The illumination of the Temple.

The third custom from which He drew His imagery, was that in which they lit up the Court of the Women [2] with such a brilliant illumination that it shed its brightness over the whole city. The light of the four great candelabra was intended to symbolise another feature of their life in the wilderness, viz., "the pillar of fire" which

[1] It was doubtless the cessation which led our Lord to point them to that Rock which it had foreshadowed, "and that Rock was Christ."—1 Cor. x. 4.

[2] The treasury mentioned in ver. 20 was in this Court. This discourse is separated in the text by the passage on "the woman taken in adultery"; but as the Revised Version says in the margin, "Most of the ancient authorities omit John vii. 53-viii. 11. Those which contain it vary much from each other." On critical evidence it is certainly not from the pen of S. John, and is out of place where it is. It has abundant marks of being written by an eye-witness, and was probably inserted here in later copies of the Gospel. Its teaching is too lofty to be lightly set aside as without authority.

had gone before them. Again, He said, the symbol was passing into the reality: "I am the Light of the world; he that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."

The fourth Feast was that of "the Encænia" or "Dedication," instituted to commemorate the cleansing of the Temple after its profanation by Antiochus Epiphanes, and the reconsecration of the Altar, B.C. 164. "It was at Jerusalem, the Feast of the Dedication, and it was winter, and Jesus walked in the Temple in Solomon's porch." The subject of His preaching to the "Jews, who came round about Him" unveils much of the mystery of His Person; but we shall more fitly consider it, when we examine the evidence of this Gospel for His Divinity.[1]

x. 22. 1. Macc. iv. 52-59. Talm Shabbath, 21b. The Encænia, or Dedication.

x. 22, 23.

The fifth and last Festival which He took part in was the Final Passover; but there is nothing in this calling for particular notice, for its circumstances are described with no less fulness by the other Evangelists.

The Final Passover.

Now the prominence given by S. John to the Judæan Ministry throws much light indirectly upon the earlier records, and removes difficulties which without this supplement would have caused

[1] *Infra*, ch. xxx.

no little perplexity. What reality it gives to His saddest outburst of disappointment and sorrow! If we read only the Gospels that preceded, we are ill-prepared for it; but in this Gospel we hear His voice in the streets and His frequent pleadings with the chief rulers of the Holy City; and we feel no surprise that His heart should have been wrung by what He had seen with His own eyes of their persistent obduracy: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, *how often* would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!"

The grounds for the lament over Jerusalem.

S.Matt.xxiii. 37.

Again, it explains the rancorous hatred which the Sanhedrim and chief priests had conceived against Him. Such bitterness could not have been the outcome of His Galilean Ministry; neither could it possibly have developed into so intensified a form during the few days of His last visit to Jerusalem. It must have been long and deep-seated, and nothing can account for it, but His successive denunciations of their conduct each time He went up to keep the Feasts.

The cause of the hatred of the Jewish priests and rulers.

We are told sometimes of the awful fickleness of a people who could cry, "Hosannah to the son of David,"

"Blessed is He that cometh in the Name of the Lord," on Palm Sunday, and "Crucify Him, crucify Him," "Not this man but Barabbas," on Good Friday; it is only when we add to the Synoptic history the supplementary Gospel that we find an explanation. They were the people from Galilee who were loudest in their acclaim, when he entered the city in triumph. He had spoken no such bitter things against them; but it was the priests and rulers of Jerusalem, who had smarted again and again under the severity of His lash, and they were the real authors of the clamour for His execution: "The chief priests moved the people": "the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude that they should ask Barabbas, and destroy Jesus."

S. Mark xv. 11.
S. Matt. xxvii. 20.

XXVI.

S. John's View of the Gospel History, and of Christ's Teaching.

S. John does not seem to have had any thought of writing history as a mere historian. In his eyes its chief interest lay in the doctrinal teaching to be deduced from it; and herein he differed widely from his predecessors in the Evangelistic office. We must remember, however, that when he wrote, fifty years had elapsed since the events of Gospel History had taken place, and probably twenty since the Synoptists finished their work.[1] Their records were widely known and read; it was not necessary, therefore, to repeat them; there can be little doubt that he was perfectly familiar with their pages, as he was with the scenes which they described; and the

In writing history S. John always tries to show the spiritual aspect of facts.

[1] There is, perhaps, hardly any question upon which scholars are more divided than the date of the Gospels. All that we feel able to say with any certainty is that S. John wrote not earlier than 85 A.D., and that none of the others were subsequent to the Destruction of Jerusalem, 70 A.D.

way in which, without design, he refers to many of them is strong corroborative testimony to their truth.

Let us take three cases to illustrate his attitude towards great historical events in our Lord's life: the Baptism, the Transfiguration, and the Ascension. S. John has no description of any of them, but he incidentally emphasises the highest import of them all. It was in His Baptism that our Lord received the unction of the Holy Ghost; the other Evangelists had put this fact in its historic setting, and S. John steps in and shows how the Baptist, who alone had witnessed the scene, "bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon Him." In like manner he testifies to the Transfiguration and its real significance, though he has nothing to say of the circumstances under which it took place, when he notices parenthetically in the sublime prologue of his Gospel, "we beheld His glory,[1] the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." It is the same with the Ascension. There is not a word to recall the final scene in which the Lord parted from the Apostles; but he bears witness to His purpose by quoting His

Our Lord's Baptism.

i. 32.

The Transfiguration.

i. 14.

The Ascension.

[1] δόξα was frequently used of the Shechinah, the symbol of God in the Holy of Holies.

xx. 17. words to Mary Magdalene, "Touch me not (literally, do not cling to me); for I am not yet ascended to My Father: but go to My brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto My father, and your Father: and to My God, and your God." What a vista it must have opened out before her of the future consequences of His final triumph, and the possibilities of a closer spiritual union[1] with her Ascended Lord!

Now inasmuch as S. John does describe certain historic incidents, passed over by the other Evangelists, it will be interesting to notice his characteristic method of dealing with history. His choice of events that seemed to him most worthy of record appears to have always fallen upon such as involved important dogmatic consequences. Two cases will suffice in illustration: the conversation with the woman of Samaria, and the resurrection of Lazarus. In the former, the circumstances of the meeting at Jacob's well are briefly told, and then follow two great truths, gradually drawn out and developed; the first that Christ is the one Fountain of living water, and the second that the day would come when

S. John's historical events doctrinally important. iv. 5-26.

xi. 11-44.

The woman of Samaria.

[1] μή μου ἅπτου: it means to cling to, to fasten on, with a view of eliciting something from the object: said of the sick who touched our Lord to be healed. Our Lord's words must have satisfied her of another and truer touching after the Ascension.

neither in Gerizim nor Jerusalem alone, but "from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same," His name should "be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto His name, and a pure offering." Malachi i. 11.

In the latter case His mode of treating history becomes especially marked, if we read it side by side with the records of raising the dead in the other Evangelists. They draw no doctrinal lessons whatever from the restoration of Jairus's daughter or the widow of Nain's son; but S. John passes beyond the historic fact which he is narrating into its deep, mysterious teaching, and not only draws from Martha a belief in the general Resurrection, but declares Himself to be "the Resurrection and the Life." The raising of Lazarus.

We gather, then, from this that S. John differed very widely from his brother Evangelists in his treatment of history. There was no discrepancy between them, but they looked at it from a different standpoint. The latter were satisfied to record events simply as illustrating our Lord's outward life and work; S. John rose to a higher aim, and recorded those only from which he was able to deduce dogmatic truths or principles. Where they wrote history alone, he wrote history with a com-

mentary upon it. He was, in short, "a theologian"[1] first; an historian second. Herein he was true to his Evangelistic emblem; for it is said that whenever the eagle descends to lower ground or lights upon the earth, it is only to rise at once, and renew its flight into the heavens.

Christ's teaching according to S. John.

Now we have seen what was the sphere in which S. John represents Christ as working; and how he looked at the events of His history; it remains to consider what side of His teaching most attracted him. It is in perfect consistency with his purpose, that, as he selected for record only those acts which had a doctrinal significance, so he should dwell mainly upon such utterances as bore the deepest and most mysterious significance.

The plain and mysterious teaching of different gospels.

The Synoptists had drawn from the storehouse of Christ's preaching all that was most simple and easy to grasp, such as the Sermon on the Mount, with its exposition, as a rule and guide for morality and practical life, or the parables,[2] which were

[1] The familiar title "The Revelation of S. John the Divine," τοῦ θεολόγου, is not according to the oldest MSS., ℵ A C, but it is in B, and it preserves a designation which he commonly bore in the Early Church.

[2] παραβολαί, are simply comparisons; the use of them by our Lord to teach the poor and ignorant was an innovation in Jewish life; for the rabbis only taught the rich and intelligent, and parables were often used by them.

often their own interpreters. They gave to the generation in which they wrote only that exoteric instruction for which their capacities, as "babes in Christ," had fitted them to receive and digest. S. John, however, writing when Christianity had largely developed, and the Ministry and Doctrines and Sacraments had become a recognised and integral part of Church life, brought to light the esoteric teaching of his Master—that which had been spoken not so much on the housetop as in the ear and within the privileged circle of his most intimate friends.[1] There was also much that Christ had taught in public, though only in proverbs,[2] which was only partially understood at the time, and S. John knew that this would afford welcome food for reflection in an age of greater intelligence and spiritual progress. And this forms a characteristic feature of his Gospel.

S. John has preserved many figures under which Christ described Himself, not one of which is found

[1] *e.g.* chh. xiv.-xvii. These were uttered in the hearing of all the Apostles, and we should have expected that S. Matthew and S. Peter would have been careful to reproduce them. The above is the only explanation of their silence.

[2] παροιμία, implying generally in the East some thing enigmatical. Cf. Ecclesiasticus viii. 8, xxxix. 3. Bengel explains it as *dictum tectius*.

Special figures descriptive of Christ's Being.

in the earlier Gospels. Seven times He used the formula "I am." In two cases in connection with His pastoral office: "I am the Good Shepherd," "I am the Door of the sheep": but in the remaining five He carries us into the mystery of His Being, applying to Himself attributes, or rather representing Himself as the impersonation of qualities which are inseparable from the Deity: "I am the Bread of Life," "I am the Light of the world," "I am the Resurrection and the Life," "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life," "I am the true Vine."

He was "the Bread of Life,"[1] for He said of Himself, "If any man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever"; "the Light of the world," for as "the Sun of righteousness" He is able to illumine the whole moral universe; "the Resurrection," for by taking man's nature into the Godhead He has revealed the perpetuity of His being; "the Life," as quickening mankind by the power of His Spirit; "the Way," because no man cometh to the Father but by Him; the Truth, as absolute and unchanging, "I am that I am"; and "the true[2] Vine," because

[1] ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν, not merely giving life, but "containing life in itself."

[2] ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινὴ, that in which the true qualities of the vine are realised; that which really is what it purports to be.

He possesses its ideal properties, and is able, as none else, to gladden "the heart of man."[1] Ps. civ. 15.

Such self-manifestations would be presumptuous and profane on the lips of one who was not superhuman. They serve, therefore, as a preparation for the great unveiling of the full glory of the Godhead, which it was the prerogative of S. John to show to the world. "These are written," he says at xx. 31. the close, "that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."

[1] The full significance of these titles will be developed in a later chapter, when we come to the Evangelist's direct teaching of Christ's Deity.

XXVII.

The Sacramental Teaching of S. John's Gospel.

S. John's omission of the Institution of the Sacraments unimportant.

In the light of what has been written above, we have no difficulty in meeting the arguments of those who think that the value of Sacramental Grace is depreciated by the fact that "the beloved disciple," who knew most of the mind of Christ, has left no record of the Institution of Holy Baptism or the Holy Eucharist. The Synoptists tell us when and where and in what words they were instituted, because at that time such information was imperatively necessary for the instruction of the Church; but when S. John wrote, the history of their origin was familiar to all; for as we find from the Epistles of S. Paul, the Sacraments had become an integral part of the Church's life. So far, then, from the omission of S. John to record the occasion on which the Apostles were directed to celebrate "the mysteries" of the Faith being any indication that he was insensible to their transcendent import, we shall be able to show that he wove the Sacramental

principles into the whole texture of his Gospel, and, as "the theologian" or "divine," unfolded not a little of their dogmatic significance.

Take first Holy Baptism. How is it that S. John makes such frequent mention of water? The references to it in the Fourth Gospel are more numerous than in all the other three together. May it not be that in his eyes the rite of Baptism had imparted a peculiar sanctity to that element? He says in his first Epistle, "there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood." The witness of the water may be read in almost every page of his Gospel; and it will come home to us with increased force when we accept the theological dogma that "the Sacraments are the extension of the Incarnation," for then water becomes inseparably united with Christ.

Frequent mention of the element of water.

1 Ep. v. 8.

The first miracle which he records is that at Cana of Galilee, in which the manifestation of Christ's glory is associated with water. Here our Lord declares to Nicodemus that "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God"; here is noticed the fact of the "much water" or many springs at Ænon,[1] where

ii. 1.

iii. 5.

iii. 23.

[1] πολλὰ ὕδατα, not πολὺ ὕδωρ, much water. Ænon is the Greek equivalent of עֵינוֹן, the Chaldee for springs. Many towns in Palestine are called from the fountains near them.

John was baptizing; here the information of John's
iii. 26. disciples that Jesus "baptizeth, and all men come to
Him"; here, by the well of water at Sychar, Christ
iv. 14, 25. reveals Himself as the Messiah, and claims to be
the Source of living water. What, again, can be
more significant than the story of Bethesda with
its pool of healing waters, type of that "laver of
regeneration" in which God has willed that the
sinner should wash away his sins and be made a
new creature? Then there is the reference to the
Lightfoot's Horæ Talm. xii. 309. mystical ritual of the Feast of Tabernacles, in which
the priest filled a golden vase with water and
Jer. Succah. v. 1. poured it out at the side of the Altar. The Talmud
explains the symbol as the giving of the Holy
vii. 38, 39. Spirit, and our Lord Himself gave the same inter-
pretation. It carries our thoughts at once to the
Sacrament of Baptism in which water and the Spirit
are intended to be linked together. Here we are
ix. 7. told of the blind man who was sent to wash in the
pool of Siloam, and "came seeing," restored from
darkness to light. It is to S. John, too, that we
owe our knowledge of a yet more important witness
to Baptismal grace, in the washing of the disciples'
feet and the pregnant declaration to S. Peter, "He
xiii. 10. that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet";
but above all it is here that we read that at the

Crucifixion "blood and water" flowed from the riven side of the Redeemer.

Now none of the above references are without significance, but three of them are so full of Sacramental teaching that they call for closer consideration.

The first is the conversation with Nicodemus, which is chosen for the Baptismal Service for such as are of riper years, as containing the express words of our Saviour Christ, that "except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God"; "whereby ye may perceive the great necessity of this Sacrament, where it may be had." Now we notice that Christ does not say to him, Except a man repent or be converted or changed in heart, but except he be "born again," and the figure is at once suggestive of an entrance into a new state. Baptismal regeneration is the correlative of original sin; and as by natural birth we enter upon a condition of life in which sin holds sway, so by Baptism we are born again, into a sphere where grace abounds; and Christ says that this transition is effected by the water and the Spirit, because He has willed to convey His greatest gifts through material means, in which the Spirit co-operates, to infuse a new quality to meet the requirements of

The conversation with Nicodemus.

the new condition. Nicodemus could not grasp the principle; but our Lord gave him no further explanation, only asserting the truth of what He had said, and that with the strongest asseveration, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen: and ye receive not our witness." Christ knew that the Sacraments were "mysteries,"[1] and as such He was content to leave them, knowing, that though hidden for a time, they were destined to be revealed hereafter: and so, though unintelligible to the great "master of Israel," and cavilled at from time to time by timid and doubting Christians, the Catholic Church has received them in all ages as "generally necessary to salvation."

Washing the disciples' feet.

The next passage is our Lord's conversation with S. Peter when He was washing the disciples' feet at the Paschal Supper. S. Peter shrank from the idea of receiving what was regarded as a menial service

[1] "Mysteries" was a favourite title for them in the Primitive Church; the earliest manual of instruction, except the *Didache*, is S. Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures on the Mysteries*, *i.e.* Holy Baptism and Holy Communion. Both the conception and the title are preserved in our Prayer-Book: "sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin" (four times repeated): "consider the dignity of that Holy Mystery and the great peril of the unworthy receiving thereof": "so shall ye be meet partakers of those holy mysteries," and "He hath ordained mysteries as pledges of His love."

from his Master: "Thou shalt never wash my feet. xiii. 8.
Jesus answered him, If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me. Simon Peter saith unto him, Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." Now this reply of S. Peter implied the thought that he was wholly unclean; but Christ told him that he had already been cleansed in his whole moral being when He enlisted him in His Service, xv. 3.
and that it was only now the partial daily pollution from contact with a sinful world that needed to be washed away. This He put before him by a vivid figure taken from the Eastern habit of bathing: "He that is washed (literally, he that has had the bath of complete immersion) needeth not save to wash his feet,"[1] that is, to be cleansed from the dust of the journey home, from which the Oriental sandals offered no protection.

Now there can be little doubt that more underlay this utterance than the Apostle could comprehend at the time; but He, Who saw the end from the beginning, knew that it would be brought to the surface, when subsequent events and teaching should

[1] ὁ λελουμένος οὐκ ἔχει χρείαν ἢ τοὺς πόδας νίψασθαι. There are three Greek words for washing: πλύνειν for inanimate things, νίπτειν, for a partitive washing, *e.g.* hands or face, λούειν, for bathing the whole body. All are found in LXX. of Lev. xv. 11; cf. also Heb. x. 23, λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα.

make it intelligible. It foreshadowed the whole doctrine of Baptismal purification: he that has once had "the laver of regeneration"[1] cannot repeat it; there is "one baptism for remission of sins," and one only; but inasmuch as he is constantly liable to post-baptismal defilement in his intercourse with the world, this must be purged away by partial and occasional cleansings through penitence, confession, and absolution.

S. Aug. in Ev. Joh. *in loco.* Ephes. iv. 5.

The last case to be considered is S. John's account of the issue of "blood and water" from the pierced side of our Lord's Body on the Cross. Attempts have been made to account for the phenomenon on purely physiological grounds,[2] but all the naturalistic explanations completely fail, because they are inconsistent with S. John's narrative. If the occurrence had not been supernatural, it is difficult to see why he should have thought it necessary to attest the truth of it by an assevera-

The blood and water from our Lord's side.

[1] Λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας. Tit. iii. 5. The Revised Version has only put "laver" in the margin, but it is almost the universal use of the word.

[2] Stroud's *The Physical Cause of the Death of Christ.* Three causes have been suggested: the spear pierced the pericardium, which contained a watery lymph, as well as the heart, or that some such matter was actually in the cavities of the heart itself; or that the blood, through decomposition having begun at death, was already being separated, the more solid from the fluid, so that it looked like blood and water.

tion of unusual force: "he that saw it bear record, and his record is true, and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe." It was surely in his eyes the foreshadowing of the great truth that the Sacraments would be the extension of the Incarnation, and that in all time Christ Himself would cleanse by the water of Baptism, and give life by His Blood; for the blood is the life and makes atonement for the soul, and it is in the Blessed Eucharist that this is applied to the individual. The Church of England has embodied this Sacramental interpretation in her Baptismal Service, saying, "The most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of our sins did shed out of His most precious side both water and blood";[1] and herein she only followed the great Fathers of primitive times. S. Chrysostom says that blood and water flowed from Christ's side of set purpose, "because the Church consisteth of these two together; and those that are initiated know it, being regenerated by water and nourished by the Flesh and Blood. Hence 'the Mysteries,' *i.e.* the Sacraments take their beginning." S. Augustine bears similar testimony: "His side was pierced by

xix. 35.

Lævit. xvii. 11, 14.

S. John vi. 53.

Hom. lxxxv.

de Civit. xxii. 17.

[1] It is because of this fact that the Church prays that the water of the Font may be sanctified "to the mystical washing away of sin."

the spear, and thence flowed forth blood and water, which we know to be the Sacraments by which the Church is built up."

There is yet another way in which we may read abundant testimony to the principle of Sacramental Grace in this Gospel: but in considering this, it is almost necessary to dwell upon both the Sacraments, though we will leave the full teaching on the Holy Eucharist for a fuller exposition.

Two words are of such frequent occurrence in this Gospel, that they may almost be called its keynote, as they certainly are the keynote of the two great Sacraments: Light and Life. Baptism is light, because it brings the soul of the baptized out of the kingdom of darkness into the light of Divine Grace; and this conception of it took firm hold of the Early Church. The Primitive Fathers never tired of enforcing this significance of the expression. "Baptism," says Justin Martyr,[1] "is called Illumination, because the mind of those who are taught, is enlightened." Clement of Alexandria,[2] S. Chrysostom,[3] and a number of others,[4] used

Christ the Light.

[1] καλεῖται τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν φωτισμός. *Apol.* ii.

[2] Speaking of Baptism, φώτισμα δι' οὗ τὸ ἅγιον ἐκεῖνο φῶς τὸ σωτήριον ἐποπτεύεται. *Pædagog.* i. vi.

[3] αἰδεσθῶμεν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην, καθ' ἣν ἡμᾶς ἐφώτισαν, *Hom.* ii. in II. *ad Tim.*

[4] Dionys. Areop., Theophyl., Greg. Naz.

similar language. S. Cyril of Jerusalem[1] wrote a series of Lectures to candidates for Baptism, and another on "the Mysteries" to those who had just received the Rite, and they are addressed to those who "are to be," or "have been lately, enlightened."

Such unanimity could only have originated in the authority of Scripture; and it is in S. John's Gospel that we find it. If, as he again and again reminds us, Christ is Light, and if it is in Holy Baptism that we are brought into vital union with Him, nothing could be more appropriate than to describe it as itself our Light or Illumination. From S. John we learn that the Baptist proclaimed Him as "the true Light which lighteth every man i. 9.
that cometh[2] into the world": and that He Himself said, "I am the Light of the world"; and the viii. 12.
same description of His Person is often repeated.[3]

It is the same with Life. Apart from the sixth Christ the Life.
chapter, upon which we shall speak in detail, Christ identifies Himself no less frequently with

[1] *οἱ φωτιζόμενοι, οἱ νεωφωτίσται.* 18 Cat. and 5 Mystagogic Lect.

[2] *ἐρχόμενον* may agree either with the Light or with every man. It is difficult to decide. The R.V. by its punctuation refers it to the former, putting the alternative in the margin.

[3] Light is mentioned above twenty times in the Gospel, though not always, of course, directly of Christ.

v. 26. Life. "As the Father hath life in Himself, so
x. 10. hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself";
xi. 25. "I am come that they might have life"; "I am
xiv. 6. the Resurrection and the Life"; "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life."

We saw above how the blood is the life. If, then, Christ gives us His Blood in the Eucharist, we can read the principle of sacramental grace in all His promises of the gift of life. The Sacrament of the Altar is intended not only to commemorate His blood-shedding, but to make man a partaker of life in the highest sense.

All this affords convincing evidence that S. John passed over the history of the Institution of Holy Baptism, yet the thought of its vital importance was rarely absent from his mind when he was writing his Gospel.

XXVIII.

The Discourse on Eucharistic Doctrine in the Synagogue at Capernaum.

The discourse in the Synagogue of Capernaum.

We turn, next, to examine the teaching of that mysterious Discourse in the Synagogue of Capernaum recorded in the sixth Chapter, for there is no fuller or more authoritative exposition anywhere to be found of the doctrine and principles of the Holy Eucharist. If we dwell upon it at length, it is only because its application to the Sacrament has been denied, and that on the ground that the Holy Eucharist was not instituted till a year afterwards, at the next Passover. We can easily show that the reason is invalid; for in other cases the Divine Prophet did speak by anticipation of things that He knew must come to pass. Thus He spoke of His Death and Resurrection; "The Son of Man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn Him to death; and shall deliver Him to the Gentiles to mock and to scourge and to crucify Him; and the third day He shall

S. Matt. x. 18. S. Luke ix. 22.

rise again." Again, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me. This He said signifying what death He should die."

S. John xii. 32, 33.

A possible reason for anticipating the Institution of the Sacrament.

It is interesting, however, to be able to discover how it was that on this occasion He came to speak beforehand of the Blessed Sacrament which He intended to institute at His Last Passover. We know that He frequently based His preaching on, or drew His illustrations from, the sights or sounds about Him. It was so in some of His most striking parables;[1] and there is evidence, if not convincing proof, that there was a remarkable feature in the Synagogue of Capernaum which prompted His line of exposition. It must often[2] have carried His thoughts on, as He looked upon it, to the Great Feast of the future, and on this occasion almost compelled Him to speak of it.

Excavations have been made on a large scale at Tell Hûm,[3] one of the supposed sites of our Lord's

[1] That of the Sower is a case in point: in *Footprints of the Son of Man* I have pointed this out in many details. Chapter xvii.

[2] Our Lord spent so much of His time at Capernaum that it was called "His own city," *ἰδία πόλις*, and once when He was there it is said there was a rumour that He was "at home," *εἰς οἶκον*. He must then have frequently attended the Synagogue.

[3] I have written of this discovery from an historic point of view in the above-named book, Chapter vi., but I am compelled to repeat what I have said in this place to show how it forms a link in the chain which connects the Discourse with the Holy Eucharist.

"own city"; and among other relics of antiquity the explorers discovered the ruins of a synagogue of unusual size and beauty, and on the lintel and side-posts of the chief doorway are carved the Pot of Manna, and a vine with clusters of grapes.

The juxtaposition of the two could not fail to be noticed by One Who saw the end from the beginning, and knew how they would one day be united in the most sacred of all ordinances. Now, there are two points of interest belonging to this synagogue; the first is its size, and herein it explains the language of the people when they told our Lord that the centurion whose servant was sick was worthy of His consideration, "for he loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue." S. Luke vii. 5. In the original it is more emphatic, for it is *the* synagogue.[1] In a place as large as Capernaum ordinarily there would be several, but such had been the liberality of their benefactor that he had built at his own expense one that must have sufficed for the worship of all.[2] Parts of the stone-work were submitted for examination to an eminent architect, who had studied the oriental schools,

[1] τὴν συναγωγὴν.

[2] Cf. *Footprints of the Son of Man*, ch. vi.

and without hesitation he fixed the date in the Herodian Dynasty.

The grandeur of the building, however, is not the only distinguishing feature, for the emblem carved on the lintel of the great doorway is, as far as present antiquarian investigations have gone, absolutely unique. Usually it was the seven-branched candlestick, to indicate that the Synagogue was a place of illumination. Now we can imagine that the people of Capernaum, having the symbol of the Pot of Manna constantly before their eyes, were familiar with the history to which it referred. When, then, our Lord bade them labour for "that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of Man" should give them, their thoughts went at once to the manna which God had sent them from heaven by the hand of Moses; and they asked Him, in effect, if He had anything better to give, and what were His credentials? Jesus shewed them that what Moses gave was not the "true bread": that which became corrupt if kept for two days could not possibly be "the bread of everlasting life." It was true their fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, but they were dead. "I," He says, "am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall

The Bread of Life.

vi. 51.

live for ever; and the bread that I will give is My flesh."[1]

"The bread that I *will* give." The future tense makes it impossible to accept the interpretation of those who see no prophetic allusion to the Holy Eucharist, but think that the language is satisfied if it be understood figuratively of the doctrine that He preached, which, like the food we eat, must be received and assimilated, so that it may become a very part of the spiritual being. Seeing that He had been preaching for two whole years, on this supposition, He must have said, "the bread that I give" or "have given," not "will give." If nothing more than this had been meant, we cannot account for the perplexity of His hearers, "How can vi. 52. this Man give us His Flesh to eat?" We cannot

[1] Wordsworth has the following summary of our Lord's teaching on the subject: "There is a gradual ascent in the language of this Discourse from one spiritual altitude to another. First He speaks of ἄρτος bread, what He Himself had just multiplied, to feed the bodies of the five thousand, and so connects His Sermon with the Miracle (verse 26); then of bread from *heaven* (verse 32); then of the bread of *God* (verse 33); then of the bread of *life* (verse 35); then of *living* bread (verse 51), and then He says that this is *Himself* (verse 51), and then that it is His flesh (verse 51), and then that it is necessary to *eat* (φαγεῖν) that flesh and drink that blood (verse 53); and then He adopts a new word for eating —a remarkable one—τρώγω. . . . It shows the need of coming to Christ in the Holy Communion with spiritual hunger and the devout craving of a famished soul for heavenly food." Comment. *in loco.*

account either for the absence of an explanation which must surely have been given, if His language admitted of such a simple interpretation. If the meaning of words, which had caused the bewilderment, could have been expressed with equal propriety in another way, so as to be rightly understood, our Blessed Lord, with all His tenderness for the weak brother, would have at once changed the language or have admitted that He was only speaking in a figure. One explanation He did give; when they imagined that He spoke of eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood in a mere carnal and material sense, He assured them that "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the Flesh profiteth nothing." He knew that the life, which He was about to give them, was His Spiritual Body, to be conveyed through the Sacrament by the power of the Eternal Spirit, taking of the things of Christ and showing them unto men.

Our Lord's words could not have been merely figurative.

vi. 63.

There is, moreover, an important similarity in His language to that which He used when Nicodemus failed to grasp the meaning of His declaration, and asked, "How can these things be?" "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, we speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness." So here He only vouchsafes a

iii. 9, 11.

Connection with His words to Nicodemus.

like reassurance of the truth of what He had said before: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you."[1] In His anticipation of both Sacraments, He leaves the perplexed inquirers unrelieved from their perplexity, satisfied to wait till after-events would explain the mysteries, and trusting to His solemn asseveration to quicken their faith meanwhile. vi. 53.

Flesh and Blood refer to our Lord's Human Nature.

What, then, is the most likely interpretation of His words? "Flesh and Blood" represent our Lord's human Nature,[2] and this, He says, is to be the source of man's life. Just as we inherit in our flesh death and corruption through our natural union with the first Adam; so we may become partakers of life and immortality through the human Nature of the Second Adam; for Christ

[1] Bishop Wordsworth calls attention to the propriety of the language: "Speaking of the initiatory Sacrament of Baptism, He had addressed His discourse to a *single* individual, Nicodemus, 'Verily, verily, I say unto *thee*,' but when He delivers His Divine Doctrine concerning the Holy Eucharist, He speaks to a *congregation*, 'Verily, verily, I say unto *you*.' In the former Sacrament every one severally is engrafted into Christ's Body; the latter Sacrament is administered to His members collectively joined together and united in Him." *Introduction to S. John's Gospel*, p. 263.

[2] Cf. S. Matt. xvi. 17, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee"; *i.e.* no mere human being, "but My Father which is in heaven." Gal. i. 16, Ephes. vi. 12, Heb. ii. 14.

vi. 52. says, "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood, dwelleth in Me and I in him": there is
vi. 54. the union. "Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day"; there is the eternal consequence.

If He had purposed to communicate His Life to the soul and spirit alone, and through the medium of His Divine Nature, no Sacramental means would have been needed for the purpose, for man can hold a spiritual communion with God without such aid. But if Christ intended to impart life to the body also they became indispensable; and that He did so intend is proved by the reiterated statement that such would be the effect of receiving His Gifts; "I will raise him up (*i.e.* his body) at the last day."

The means ordained for this purpose were provided, when at the Last Supper, "as they did eat,
S. Matt. xxvi. 26-28. Jesus took bread and blessed and brake it, and
S. Mark xiv. 22-24. gave to them, and said, Take, eat: this is My Body. And He took the cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them: and they all drank of it. And He said unto them, This is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for
S. Luke xxii. 19. many," adding also, according to S. Luke, "This do in remembrance of Me."

That our Lord, when He instituted this Feast,

had in His mind what He had said the year before in the synagogue at Capernaum seems to follow of necessity from two considerations: the first, that He used almost identical language in both, and never besides spoke in terms bearing the least resemblance to it; and the second, that if He intended the Discourse at Capernaum to interpret the Institution in the Upper Chamber, all is intelligible; but if not, we are driven to the almost impossible conclusion that Christ established a Sacrament, which was destined to be the centre of man's spiritual life in every age, without a single word to prepare him for its high purpose or to enforce its need.

The necessary connection between the Discourse and the Eucharist.

Further, the Church has unquestionably bound the two together, as may be seen in the writings of her Divines in all ages, and pre-eminently in the language of her Liturgies.[1]

SS. Chrysostom, Cyril, Augustine.

That S. John did not himself record the history of the Institution of the Blessed Sacrament cannot militate in the slightest degree against its tran-

Reasons why S. John omitted the history of the Institution.

[1] One example will suffice. In our Prayer-book we read, "the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that Holy Sacrament, for then we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood." And again, we pray "so to eat the Flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His Blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body": and in the Form of Administration the Body and Blood are said to preserve our body and soul unto everlasting life.

scendent importance: it was his invariable rule only to write history when it was absolutely necessary, or when he could unfold the doctrinal teaching of the events commemorated. That which underlay the action of our Lord at the Last Supper he had already set forth in all the fulness of the Divine exposition.

It is sometimes said that we have no right to assume that he would not repeat what was already written, because this very chapter contradicts it. The miracle of feeding the five thousand had been narrated by all the other Evangelists, and that with remarkable accuracy of detail, and yet S. John finds it a place in his Gospel; and the reason was, because they had omitted what in his eyes gave it its highest value, viz., the dogmatic consequences which our Lord deduced from it. "It seems as if when anything earthly was mentioned, it was to introduce more at length that which is heavenly"; and S. John, herein, is like the eagle; for if it lights upon the lower ground, it is only at once to spring up again, and take its flight into the higher regions. The omission, then, to record this historic fact by such a writer as S. John is comparatively quite unimportant, because the whole Gospel is permeated with Sacramental doctrine.

XXIX.

S. John's witness to the Grace of Absolution.

We owe to S. John the record of the direct words in which Christ gave to the Apostles the power of absolving sins in His name. The commission was fraught with mystery, and the mode of conveying it highly sacramental; for both these reasons we are not surprised that it found a place in the most dogmatic of all the Gospels. This is its history; for three years our Lord had been engaged in His earthly ministry; He had associated the Apostles with Himself in many branches of His work, in preaching, and healing the sick, and the dispossession of evil spirits, and the Synoptic Evangelists record the fact, but "the ministry of reconciliation" through the forgiveness of sins, or the absolution of the penitent, Christ had so far kept entirely in His own hands. None but Christ is said to have exercised the absolving power. They are His words and His alone, to

The commission to forgive sins not bestowed till the close of Christ's Ministry.

S. Matt. ix. 2. the paralysed man: "Son, be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee": His alone, to the woman

S. Luke vii. 48, 50. that was a sinner: "Thy sins are forgiven: thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace."

But Christ was going away in the Flesh, and He saw that the delegation of this, His highest and most mysterious function, was necessary for the well-being of the Church which He was founding; and as He had chosen to use the instrumentality of a human Ministry in bringing men to repentance, so He saw fit to go further and bestow mediately by the action of others the benefits of redemption, the remission of sins. It is S. John who has preserved the record of the manner and the words in which this awful commission was intrusted to the Apostles.

According to the disciplinary phraseology, which became common in the Church, it may be thought that S. Matthew had anticipated him in making known that Jesus Christ intended to convey this power to the Apostles. He tells us how He said

S. Matt. xvi. 19. to S. Peter: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven": but it was only in lapse of

time that the Church associated binding and loosing with the retention and remission of sins in her system of penitential discipline; certainly in S. Matthew's time, such an expression had another meaning. To bind and to loose were simply household phrases in the Jewish Schools for prohibition and permission. For instance, about half a century before Christ the order of Scribes became separated into two strongly marked divisions under Shammai and Hillel, the one rigidly orthodox and conservative, even of the very letter of tradition, the other the representative of freedom of thought, and in all things strongly liberal. They stamped their individuality in endless ways on the legislation of the day, "Shammai binds," "Hillel looses."[1] You may find the expressions over and over again in the Talmud. We cannot think, then, that, when S. Matthew recorded this commission, he had at all grasped the fulness of the sense in which it would be received in later times.[2]

The strictly Jewish meaning of binding and loosing.

Lightfoot's Horæ Talm. xi. 226.

[1] *e.g.* Shammai bound, *i.e.* forbade divorce save only for inchastity; Hillel loosed, *i.e.* allowed it "for any cause," even for incompatibility of temper.

[2] Lightfoot, who was well versed in the Talmud, says, "To think that Christ, when He used the common phrase, was not understood by His hearers, in the common sense, shall I call it a matter of laughter or of madness?" He illustrates how the power was used in the Church in regard to circumcision and vows of purification.

Now there is something deeply mysterious connected with the delegation of the absolving function which fills us with awe: something in the manner of conveying the gift as well as in the words by which Christ prepared the Apostles for its reception. There was a rooted conviction in the Jewish mind that the forgiveness of sins was the sole prerogative of God Himself. We read it in the shock which the bare thought of curing Naaman of his leprosy gave to the king of Israel: "Am I God, to kill and to make alive, that this man doth send unto me to recover a man of his leprosy?" He believed that no human being could heal that disease, simply because it was regarded by the Jew as the very symbol of sin. The same belief finds a direct expression in the New Testament in the question of the Scribes and Pharisees, when they heard our Lord's pardon granted to the paralysed penitent, "Who is this which speaketh blasphemies? Who can forgive sins, but God alone?"

The Jewish belief that man could not absolve from sin.

2 Kings v. 7.

S. Luke v. 21.

It was surely the knowledge of this conviction, the realisation of the difficulty which even Apostles would feel, when they heard that what was held to be the inalienable right of the Godhead was to be devolved upon themselves, that led our Lord

"to make a new thing," and accompany the commission by an indicative action of a most deeply significant kind: "Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." "He breathed on them." There is nothing like it in all His other actions; we must go back to the creation of man for a parallel, when "God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." If, as the Jewish doctors taught, God imparted to Adam by that inbreathing not only the principle of life but also the Holy Spirit, it is easy to understand why our Lord, when delegating to the Apostles the power to exercise a Divine prerogative, should quicken their apprehension of the gift by a symbolical act, indicating the actual transmission of something, which came as it were from His innermost self; "He breathed on them." Indeed, says one [1] who had a deep insight into the mysteries of the Catholic Faith, the words of the commission

The symbolical meaning of breathing on the Apostles.

St. John xx. 21-23.

The Creation of Adam. Gen. ii. 7.

[1] The late Bishop Woodford. Cf. *The Great Commission*, p. 59.

that followed "are no common words: they run up into great and awful mysteries. First uttered by Christ on the night of the Resurrection, they sound like a voice out of the Eternity from which He had just returned. They unite the two worlds, the visible and the invisible, in one joint act. The agency of men and the authority of God concur in fulfilling them. They would themselves, if they stood alone, suffice to cast over the Christian Church the shadow of things unseen, to link our feeble ministerings with mightier powers. And they are words, too, which assuredly have in them a sound of exceeding blessedness, of forgiveness of sin brought very near, not to be sought only amid cloud and darkness, not to be reached after by the soul struggling to draw nigh with fear and trembling to the steps of a Throne too awful for mortal gaze to be lifted unto; but sent down from the height to the depths to meet the returning prodigal half-way, to stop his penitential cry, "Father, I have sinned before Thee," with the utterance of love impatient of restraint, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee."

"This," Hooker says,[1] "is that grand original warrant, by force whereof the guides and prelates in God's Church, first His Apostles, and afterwards

[1] *Eccl. Pol.* Book vi. ch. iv. 1.

others following them successively, did both use and uphold that discipline, the end whereof is to heal men's consciences, to cure their sins, to reclaim offenders from iniquity, and to make them, by repentance, just."

The former passage is quoted to bring out in forcible language the great solemnity of the occasion: the latter, to counteract, by the weightiest authority on the constitution of the Church, the claim that has been made, that the commission was given not to the Apostles but to the whole Church, laity as well as priests: that it is "the charter of the Christian Church, and not simply the charter of the Christian ministry," or again, that "the gift was conveyed once for all. No provision was laid down for its transmission."

Objection that the commission was given to the whole Church.

The only ground for this belief is that S. Thomas was absent and that S. Luke speaks of others than the Apostles being present: "And they," the two disciples from Emmaus, "rose up the same hour and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them." Whether the others here spoken of remained to the end we know not; S. Luke says nothing of their receiving a commission; S. John gives no hint of their presence when this was bestowed upon the

S. Luke xxiv. 33.

Apostles. In his eyes it certainly was not a commission as well "on behalf of the non-ministerial part of the Church," [1] but was intended only for the Apostolic order, for this and this alone is spoken of. "It was so given in accordance with that counsel and decree of God, by which He made the Ministry of the Church to spring from a very small number of men rather than from a larger number."

The gift intended to be passed on by transmission.

But it is said that no provision was made for transmitting the absolving gift; such an objection evacuates the words, by which its bestowal was prefaced, of their most obvious significance: "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." If Christ, in accordance with His Father's Will, had gathered out of the number of believers a chosen ministry whom He had called and ordained and associated with Himself in the conversion of the world, it was their duty to do the same when He was gone; if Christ had received "power on earth to forgive sins," and had given them power to forgive in His Name, it was their prerogative by His authority

S. Mark ii. 10.

[1] It is said that S. John, who records this, lays stress elsewhere on the priesthood of the laity, and that S. Peter does the same; but surely the language which they use points to the analogy of the priesthood of Israel, in which there was a wide gulf between that of the people and the special ministerial priesthood. The whole circumstances of this commission point to its reception by the chief in the ministry, as one of their most special functions.

to transmit it to others; and so from that day forward the Church through nineteen centuries of chequered history has never doubted that the gift was intended to be passed on—passed on as long as sin shall last and man have need of absolution. It is a cause for thankfulness that in the great upheaval of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, even with the knowledge of the notorious abuses of the absolving power in the Middle Ages fresh in her memory, the Anglican Church deliberately retained the ancient form,[1] and with no stammering tongue has said to every priest as he received his ordination the selfsame words: "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained."

[1] We do not know in what terms the ordination gift was bestowed in early times; but that it was given there can be no doubt. Nothing, *e.g.*, can testify to it more clearly than the words of S. Cyprian in the year 256. After quoting our Lord's declaration to the Apostles, "As My Father," etc. etc., and "He breathed on them and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit," etc., he writes, "Whence we perceive that only they who are of the Church and established in the Gospel law by the Lord's ordination are allowed to baptize and to give remission of sins."*

The certain use of the actual words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," etc., cannot be traced beyond the tenth century. Morinus, 279 E. Martene, ii. 327. For the Sarum Use, the form was much shorter than in the Reformed Ordinal: simply, accipe Spiritum Sanctum: quorum remiseris peccata, remittuntur eis: et quorum retinueris, retenta erunt.

* *Ep. ad Jubaianum*, lxxii. (Oxf. Ed. *Ep.* lxxiii. 7).

XXX.

Christ's Self-revelation the surest Evidence of His Godhead.

THE Evangelist rises to still greater heights of faith and doctrine, and finds rest only in setting forth, both directly and indirectly, the absolute Godhead of Jesus Christ.

The teaching of the Prologue the key to the Gospel.

That this was the real aim of His Gospel is shown, when He asserts at the very opening of its sublime Prologue, that "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."

The Word here is unquestionably a Person—and none other than Jesus Christ, for it almost immediately follows, "The Word was made Flesh and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth." It has been well said that this is "the most absolute dogma in the sense of authoritative utterance conceivable. The

Church in all her creeds, articles, standards, decrees of council, has added nothing to it. In fact, nothing can go beyond it in the direction of the glory of the Eternal Son." [1]

Then S. John sets his seal to all that he recorded in the pages that follow, in support of this tremendous truth, by inserting at the close, perhaps the very close,[2] of the Gospel the spontaneous confession of the convinced Apostle, "My Lord and my God."

We can imagine the satisfaction with which he penned the words, now that the ordained purpose was gained, and his joy fulfilled, "These are writ- xx. 31.
ten that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."

Between the two declarations, at the beginning and the end, he traces as indirect evidence his Lord's self-revelation, in which He claimed, one after another, attributes that belong to God and God alone.

These claims, we think, are the most certain evidence of the truth, especially because no doubt has been thrown upon any part of the text in

[1] Cf. Sadler's *Com. in loco.*

[2] In support of the view that Chapter xxi. is an Epilogue or Appendix, the reader may consult Bishop Westcott's *Comment.* p. 299.

which they are embodied: whereas this cannot be asserted of some passages which express it in so many words.

Christ's claim to be without sin, never put forward by men.

What is Christ's attitude towards sin? It is, we know, an axiom of Holy Scripture that there is no man who sinneth not. "All have sinned," is the verdict of S. Paul, and all good and holy men have been conscious of it. Indeed the holier they have become and the higher the standard of goodness they have reached, the more conscious they have been of their unworthiness. Isaiah, the greatest of the prophets, despite his high prerogative as the very mouthpiece of the Most High, exclaimed, "Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips." And S. Paul, who had even been caught up into Paradise, pronounced himself to be the chief of sinners, and mourned over his danger of falling into sin, confessing that he was obliged to keep under his body, and make it his slave, lest he should be a castaway. So too with others in every age, S. Augustine, S. Francis, Thomas à Kempis, we know that we should have condemned them at once, if they had made no confession of sin. Now contrast with all these our Lord's claims in His relationship to sin. We search in vain for confessions of remorse or peni-

Rom. iii. 23.

Isa. vi. 5.

1 Tim. i. 15.

1 Cor. ix. 27.

tence, even for the least trace of a consciousness of any transgression; but on the contrary He asserted that all His actions were right in God's sight: "I do always those things that please Him." S. John viii. 29, 46. Yea more, He challenged His enemies to lay anything to His charge: "Which of you convinceth Me of sin?" And how was the challenge met? We fancy we may see it taken up by the Jews when they accused Him of blasphemy; but that was only because He claimed to be their Messiah, the Son of God, and for this they put Him to death. If they intended to insinuate any moral transgression when they called Him "a malefactor," they could not have spoken the conviction of their hearts, for they never seriously adhered to it. This is all the more remarkable, because He had laid Himself open to accusations; He had lived in familiar intercourse with the very outcasts of society, eating and drinking with publicans and harlots. How differently were S. Francis and S. Vincent de Paul, the purest of men, treated in this respect![1] The pestilential breath of calumny and slander was for ever being breathed upon them; but our Lord's worst enemies never raised

[1] Cf. De Lammenais, *Ess. sur l'Indiff.* iv. 201, qu. by Farrar in *Bampt. Lect.* ii. 83 *n.*

a suspicion against His spotless purity and innocence. No, if we would learn the true verdict of His generation, let us ask the conscious-smitten traitor, "I have betrayed the innocent blood"; or Pilate's wife, "Have thou nothing to do with this just Man"; or the dying thief, "This Man hath done nothing amiss"; or the impatient judge, when overborne against his convictions, "I am innocent of the blood of this just Person."

The enemies of Christ acknowledged His innocence.

Let eighteen centuries pass, and hear again the verdict of hostile critics in our own time; they will not admit His claims to the Godhead, but they are compelled to acknowledge His immunity from sin. "Sinless in the present, and painless as regards the past," is the striking testimony of Keim. "The moral Ideal of Humanity"; "one in Whom is centred all that there is in our nature of what is good and elevated" is the still more striking confession of Renan. "Nothing purer, nobler, has yet dawned on human thoughts" was the grand estimate of Channing.[1]

Modern critics have done the same.

True, from time to time we have heard it said that He shewed signs of disobedience, petulance, and anger, and these partake of the nature of sin;

Charges against Him of faults not substantiated.

[1] The testimony of adversaries has been gathered together in several treatises, notably Dr. Chadwick's Donellan Lectures for 1878, and H. B. Ottley's Lectures on "the Great Dilemma."

but such charges are easily refuted, for, if He did tarry behind and cause His parents to seek Him sorrowing, it was surely in the knowledge that they would be more than compensated afterwards; and thoughtful divines have read in the action God's direct over-ruling, that they might realise, by what they witnessed, even more than before the sacredness of their charge. If, again, He withered the fruitless fig-tree, it was that the Jews, who were deaf to His spoken parables, might possibly be awakened by one in act; and as for His anger, it was self-controlled and righteous indignation, not like the passion of men for violated self-love, but solely against outraged holiness.

No, it is impossible to convict Christ of sin of any kind, and we have the undisputed authority of inspired Apostles and writers to certify this. "He hath made Him to be sin for us Who knew no sin." 2 Cor. v. 21. "The precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." 1 S. Pet. i. 19. "He was manifested to take away our sins, and in Him is no sin." 1 S. John iii. 5. "Such an High Priest became us, Who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners." Heb. vii. 26.

What interpretation, then, must we put upon His own self-witness, "The Prince of this world cometh

and hath nothing in Me,"[1] borne out, as it is, by the evidence of friend and foe alike? There is only one that is possible, viz., that He was exempted from all the sinful conditions of humanity, because He was God.

Claim to Pre-existence.

A second claim was to pre-existence before He was born of the Blessed Virgin, and of such a kind as to preclude all those theories of metempsychosis, which were then in vogue at Alexandria and elsewhere, and to carry with it a revelation of His eternal and Divine Nature.

Origen's theory on pre-existent souls.

The belief that the souls of men had been created, long before the bodies which they were destined to inhabit, had found a wide acceptance. Origen had a beautiful theory that the best of souls had dwelt in the sun and moon and stars, before they lived upon earth; and others have found in this a possible explanation of Christ's declaration that He "came down from heaven"; but it was wholly inconsistent with what He said, that He had not only come into this world from the Father, but that He would leave it again to go to His Father; more especially with the language of His prayer, "And

S. John xvi. 28.

[1] The whole question should be studied in Carl Ullmann's, *The Sinlessness of Jesus an Evidence for Christianity*, Clark, trans., in which he considers it, as it is testified to by different authors and in divers ways.

now, O Father, glorify Thou Me with Thine own Self with the glory which I had with Thee before the world was"; it was a petition that He might receive again the fulness of that glory, which is the sum of the Divine attributes, of which, by the Incarnation, He had emptied Himself for a time. S. John xvii. 5.

Yet further, the declaration of S. John that "in the beginning" He "was with the Father," is wholly inconsistent with the common theory of the transmigration of souls, and carries us back to His existence in eternity. "In the beginning,"[1] *i.e.* the initial moment, before time began its course, before Creation, before the world was, "before all worlds," the Word, the personification of the Divine Intelligence and Wisdom, co-existed with the Father: "He possessed[2] Me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. . . . Then I was by Him as One brought up with Him; and I was daily His delight; rejoicing always before Him." Whether we are Prov. viii. 22, 23.

[1] It takes us to Gen. i. 1 בְּרֵאשִׁית, but even further back—for Moses begins with creation, S. John with Him Who created it.

[2] In the Arian controversy this expression was used as an argument against the coexistence of Christ with the Father: but only because the LXX. had chosen to translate it ἔκτισε μέ. Aquila, who is known to have translated literally, renders it, ἐκτήσατο.

justified in directly applying these words to our Lord or not, they bear a striking resemblance to the Prologue of S. John, and we can hardly doubt that they were intended to prepare men for it. Perhaps, however, the strongest proof of what He claimed touching His pre-existence may be drawn from the application to Himself of that most significant designation, "I am,"[1] given of old by God Himself, as the title by which He desired to be known: "Say unto the children of Israel, 'I am' hath sent me unto you." He employed it to express the character of His Being, and divers phases of His Personality: "I am" the Life: "I am" the Truth. He appealed to it, perhaps, when the soldiers came to arrest Him in Gethsemane, and asked Him who He was; "I am" was His answer, and, it may be, at that moment there streamed forth from His face a ray of the brightness of the Deity, for they fell prostrate to the ground. But there are more definite proofs than these, where He used the Name to establish His eternal existence.

Christ's pre-existence from eternity.

Exod. iii. 14.

Read His conversation with the Jews touching their father Abraham: "Art Thou greater than our

[1] That this name implied, "The Ever-Existent," was implicitly believed by the Jews, so much so that some of their Rabbis held that יהוה, Jehovah, was a compound of three parts of the verb to be היה, being, has been, will be.

father Abraham, which is dead? and the prophets are dead: Whom makest Thou Thyself? Jesus answered . . . Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day; and he saw it, and was glad. Then said the Jews unto Him, Thou art not yet fifty years old,[1] and hast thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am." S. John viii. 53-58.

To the finite gaze of the Jews Jesus was under fifty; centuries, therefore, younger than the Patriarch; but the real difference between the two lay in this, Abraham was created,[2] He was uncreated: Abraham was temporal, He was eternal: for "before Abraham was, I am"; *i.e.* before Abraham was born of human parents in time, I was self-existent from eternity, the Great "I am," "Whose goings forth," as Micah said, "have been from of old, from everlasting"; "the High and Lofty One," as said Isaiah, "that inhabiteth eternity." Micah v. 2. Isa. lvii. 15.

When He said this, it is written, the Jews "took

[1] Jesus was at this time only thirty-three, but the belief spread that he was fifty, and it was not wholly corrected till the fourth century. Irenæ. ii. 39; Euseb. i. 10.

[2] *πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγὼ εἰμί.* S. Aug. says, "Weigh well the words and note the mystery, because Abr. was made (fieret). Understand the word of the making of man, of man's coming into being, but understand 'I am' to pertain to the substance of the Godhead."

up stones to cast at Him": they thought that He was guilty of blasphemy, and He gave them no other explanation; He said not a single word to modify their inference from His language, but left them to believe that He claimed, as indeed He did, the prerogative of the ever-existent, uncreated God.

Claim to be the Son of God, equal with the Father.

S. Matt. xxvi. 66.

A third claim which Christ made was to be the Son of God. This S. Matthew tells us was the ground upon which the Jews condemned Him for blasphemy, and adjudged that "He is guilty of death." The circumstance, if taken by itself, as a mere historical fact, would involve no little perplexity, because there is nothing in the context to imply that He trenched upon the prerogatives of God;[1] but S. John explains why they at once interpreted the claim as they did. His narrative of two previous disputes with the Jews makes it perfectly clear. After healing the cripple at the pool of Bethesda, when they cavilled at His breach of the Sabbath, He claimed "a parity of working power" with God the Father, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work"; and also a right to precisely the same

S. John v. 17, 21, 23.

[1] He tells them, it is true, that hereafter He would be seen "sitting on the right hand of power"; but in itself this would hardly have called forth the charge of blasphemy.

homage. If He had given life to the impotent man, He had, He said, the same power as the Father to quicken the dead: "For as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom He will."

So in like manner He asserted His right to the honour that was given to the Father; and to deny it to Him was to take it also away from God: for "all men," He said, "should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father which hath sent him."

Again, when in Solomon's Porch they begged Him to tell them plainly if He was the Messiah, He asserted His oneness with the Father; "I and my Father are one": not one Person, not εἷς, but one essence, ἕν, or as the Nicene Creed says, "of the one substance."[1] There can be no mistake as to the meaning which He intended His words to convey, "for the Jews took up stones again to stone Him"; and they give their reason: it was "for blasphemy: and because that Thou, being a man,

S. John x. 30-33.

Consubstantial with the Father.

[1] The words have formed the subject of no little controversy with Unitarians. The ἐσμὲν, sumus, we are, is the safeguard against Sabellius; ἕν, unum, delivers from the heresy of Arius. It was on this that the doctrine of the Homoousion consubstantial was based.

makest Thyself God." A little later, when He vindicated the title "Son of God," He claimed their belief that "the Father is in Me, and I in Him"; and it enraged them still more, and "they sought again to take Him."

All this enables us to realise to the full what He claimed when He was placed at the bar of judgment on a trial for His life, and the High Priest adjured Him by the Living God, "tell us whether Thou be the Christ, the Son of God;" and He answered, according to the Jewish manner of affirmation, "Thou hast said," *i.e.* I am.

That he was the Son of God.

With this the self-witness of Jesus closed; it was His last claim, made in the face of the world, for the full assurance of all after-generations, with all the superadded force of an oath, and in the supreme moment of His life, that he was in the highest sense "the Son of God," and He sealed the declaration with His blood.

His claims cannot be disallowed.

Now what is the conclusion which all this forces upon us? We have seen that He was a character of perfect holiness, truth, and honesty; for even His enemies conceded it; there is no alternative, therefore, but to believe that He could not put forward a pretender's claim, but that what He claimed to be, that He was, in deed and in truth, the Son of

God, and "equal with the Father as touching His Godhead."

Thus we see that S. John not only mounts up as it were on eagle's wings, dwelling on high and heavenly themes, such as the doctrine of priestly absolution or the mystery of the Sacraments, but he goes yet further, and, like the eagle, which is said to be able to gaze upon the sun with undazzled eyes, he penetrates into the very depths of the Divine existence, and unveils the true nature of Christ as "very God."

The importance of realising the Godhead of Christ.

Would we measure then the extent of what we owe to S. John for his clear unveiling of the Godhead of Christ, it is simply this: All our hopes, all our peace, all forgiveness of man's sins, depend on the Death of Christ, and the virtue of that Death lies in the belief that He Who died was God as well as Man. Take away this assurance, and the Death upon the Cross was but the heroic end of an heroic life; and then as an atonement for sin it is wholly inadequate. What set an inestimable price upon the sacrifice, what gave it its infinite worth, was the fact that it was that of the Son of God. The chasm which sin had made between heaven and earth was such that no one could bridge it over who could not set one hand on heaven and the other on earth.

The separation between God and man was so wide, that they could only be reunited by Him Who was both the one and the other: and S. John has left indisputable proof that such was Jesus Christ, very God and perfect Man.

INDEX.

Absolution and Pardon, the Priest in, 175-178.
Absolution, witness of S. John to the grace of, 249-257.
Acrostic aids to memory among the Jews, 4.
Ænon, 193.
Alexandria, founding of the Church at, 85.
Allusions to money in the First Gospel, 32.
"Anamnesis" and "mnemosunon," 185.
Anointings of our Lord, the different, 145.
—— Roman theory of the, 147.
Antioch, the birthplace of S. Luke, 119.
Apocryphal Gospel according to the Hebrews, the, 40.
Aramaic phrases in the Second Gospel, 7, 91.
Author of the Fourth Gospel a Palestinian Jew, the, 192.
Authorship of the First Gospel, the, 31-39.
—— Second Gospel, the 75-85.
—— Third Gospel, the, 117-124.
—— Fourth Gospel, the, 191-200.

Babylon identified with Rome, 84.
Being of Christ, the, described by S. John, 271.
Bethany, 193.
Bethesda, 193.
Binding and loosing in its Jewish meaning, 251.
Boswell, Dr. Johnson's "Table-Talk" by, 3.
Breathing on the Apostles by Christ, the, 253.

Calf or Ox, the, S. Luke's emblem, 167.
Capernaum, the Discourse in the Synagogue there, 239-248.
Cerinthus, the story of, 202, 203.
Character of the Eucharist, the sacrificial, 182-187.
Christ as a Prophet, 20.
—— as Priest and Victim, 167.
—— His Church a Kingdom, 62.
—— His habit of praying, 171.
—— His Intercessory Office, 171-174.
—— His claim to pre-existence, 264-266.
—— His claim to Sinlessness, 260-264.
—— His claim to be the Son of God, 268-270.
—— His Royalty, 54.
—— individual conceptions of His Person, 20.
—— the Life and Light, 236, 237.
Christ's self-revelation the evidence of His Godhead, 258-272.
Christian Missions in India, 70.
Christian Art and the Evangelistic Symbols, 24.
—— on the penitent woman, 144.
Church, the, a kingdom, 62, 65.
—— dignity of the, 69.
—— parables concerning the, 63.

Church, unity of the, 66.
Cleansing of lepers, the, 176.
Creatures, the four living, 21.

Dedication, Feast of the, 212.
Different Anointings of our Lord recorded, 145.
Dives and Lazarus, the Parable of, 161.
Door of the Sanctuary, the, 23.
Dreams, Jewish estimate of, 47-50.
Dream of Joseph, the, 49.
—— of Procla, the, 50.
Drummond on Evolution and Revelation, 15.

Epiphanius, the δευτέρωσις of, 4.
Eucharist, doctrine of the, in the Synagogue, 239-248.
—— the, its Sacrificial character, 182-187.
Evangelists, selection of the, 16.
—— the, sources from which they derived their information, 1-9.
—— symbols of the, 24.
—— —— S. Augustine on the, 26.
—— —— S. Jerome on the, 25.
Evolution and Revelation, Drummond on, 15.
Exaltation of Womanhood in S. Luke's Gospel, 134-143.
Excavations at Tell Hûm, 240, 241.
Explanation of historical inaccuracy in S. Matthew's Gospel, 15.

Fathers, the, on the double anointing of Christ, 158.
—— on the four living creatures, 21.
—— on the influence of S. Peter upon the author of the Second Gospel, 81-85, 102.
Feasts, Our Lord's attendance at Jewish, 212.
Feast of Dedication, the, 212.
Feast of Purim, the, 213.
—— of Tabernacles, the, 214.
—— of Trumpets, 214.
Final Passover, the, 217.
First Gospel, authorship of the, 31-39.
Four living creatures, the, 21.
"Fourfold Gospel, a," secured to us, 17.
Fourth Gospel, authorship of the, 191-200.
—— its author intimate with our Lord, 197.
—— written by an eye-witness, 195.
Fulfilment of Messianic Prophecy, 51-61.

Gemara, the, 4.
Genealogy, the, in the First Gospel, 54, 55.
—— in the Third Gospel, 121.
Godhead of Christ, the, as evidenced by His self-revelation, 258-272.
Gospel according to the Hebrews, the, 40.
—— authorship of the First, the, 31-39.
—— —— Second, the, 75-85.
—— —— Third, the, 117-124.
—— —— Fourth, the, 191-200.
—— the, inspired by the Holy Ghost, 10.
—— Jewish features in the First, 40-46.
—— the oral, 6.
—— S. John's, different from the Synoptic Gospels, 8.
—— the, written down by others besides the four Evangelists, 1.
Grace of Absolution, the, S. John's witness to, 249-257.
Graphic style of S. Mark, the, 86-93.
Guidance of the Holy Ghost in the Evangelist's work, 10.

HEAVEN, the Kingdom of, 43.
—— —— Parables of, 56.
Hebrew Version of S. Matthew's Gospel, 41.
Hillel and Shammai, 251.
Historical naccuracy of the First Gospel, explained, 15.
Holy Ghost, the inspirer of the Gospel narrative, the, 10.
Horns of Hattîn, the, 56.
Human characteristics of Christ brought out in the Second Gospel, 105-114.
Humanity of Jesus Christ, the, 105-114.

IDENTIFICATION of Levi and Matthew, 35.
Illumination of the Temple, the, 216, 217.
India, Christian Missions in, 70.
Individuality of the Evangelist, the, 18-27.
—— Westcott on, 18.
Individual conceptions of Christ's Person, 20.
Influence of S. Paul on the author of the Third Gospel, 118-121.
—— of S. Peter on the author of the Second Gospel, 94-103
Information of the Evangelists, sources of the, 1-9.
Inspiration, various views of, 12.
Institution of the Eucharist omitted by S. John, 247, 248.
Intercessory Office of Christ, the, 171-174.

JERUSALEM, Christ's Ministry in, 210-219.
Jesus Christ, His Godhead, 258-272.
—— His Humanity, 105-114.
Jewish aids to memory, 4.
—— estimate of dreams, 47-50.
—— Feasts in the Fourth Gospel, 212-217.
Jewish features in the First Gospel, 47-50.
—— meaning of binding and loosing, 251.
—— views of leprosy, 43.
Johnson's "Table-Talk," 3.

KINGDOM of Christ's Church, the, 62-72.
—— of Heaven, the, 43, 62.
—— —— parables of, 56.

LEAVEN, parable of the, 64.
Legends of S. John's indestructible life, 206-209.
Lepers, cleansing of the, 176.
Leprosy, Jewish views of, 43.
Levi and Matthew identified, 35.
Life and Character of the Blessed Virgin, 137.
Life of S. John the Evangelist, 197-200.
Light and Life and the Two Sacraments, 236-238.
Lightfoot on hostile criticism, 191.
"Little entrance," the, 24.
Living creatures, the Four, 21.
—— —— the Fathers on the, 21.
Luther's "Table-Talk," 3.

"MALCHA MESSHIKA," the, 52.
Matthew and Levi identified, 35.
Mechanical Inspiration, meaning of, 12.
Medical phraseology in S. Luke's Gospel, 125-133.
Memory, Jewish aids to, 4.
Messiah, a suffering, 60.
—— His threefold office, 52.
Messianic Prophecy fulfilled, 51-61.
Ministry in Jerusalem, the, described by S. John, 210-219.
Miracles, two peculiar to S. Mark, 91.
Mishnah, the, 4.

Mission of the Seventy related by S. Luke, 123.
"Mnemosunon" and "Anamnesis," 185.
Money, allusions to, in the First Gospel, 32.
Mount Hattin, 56.

NET, Parable of the, 65.
Nicodemus, conversation with, 231, 232.

OFFICE, Christ's Intercessory, 171-174.
Oral Gospel, the, 6.
—— tradition, its value, 2.
Origin of the Synoptic Gospels, the, 8.
Ox or Calf, the, as the emblem of S. Luke, 167.

PALESTINIAN JEW, a, author of the Fourth Gospel, 192.
Parables concerning the Church, 63.
—— of the Kingdom, 56.
—— related only by S. Luke, 128.
Parable, the, of Dives and Lazarus, 161.
—— of the Net, 65.
Paradise, S. Luke and S. Paul on the subject of, 162.
Passover, the Final, 217.
Penitent thief, the promise to the, 159.
Person of Christ, the, 20.
Phrases, Aramaic, in the Second Gospel, 7.
Physical Causes of the Death of Christ, 234.
Plain, the Sermon on the, 44.
Plenary inspiration, meaning of, 12.
Polycarp, S. John's pupil, 202.
Pool of Siloam, the, 214.
Position of women, the, among heathen nations, 135.
—— among the Jews, 134.
Prayers of Christ, the, 171-174.
Priestly attributes, 179-181.
—— office, the, 168.
Priest and Victim, Christ as, 167.
—— in absolution, the, 175-178.
Priesthood of Christ, the, 166-170.
Procla, her dream, 50.
Prologue of S. John's Gospel, the, its key, 258.
Prophet, Christ as a, 20.
Prophecy, fulfilment of Messianic, 51-61.
Psalm cxix., construction of, 5.
Purim, Feast of, 213.

REVELATION AND SCIENCE, their connection, 14.
Revelations of the Unseen World, 156-165.
Roman theory of the different anointings of Christ, 147.
Royalty of Christ, the, as shown in the First Gospel, 54.

SACRAMENTAL Teaching of S. John's Gospel, 228-238.
Sacrificial character of the Eucharist, the, 182-187.
S. Augustine on the Symbols of SS. Matthew and Mark, 26.
S. Jerome on the Symbols of SS. Matthew and Mark, 25.
S. John, the author of the Fourth Gospel, 191-200.
S. John's frequent mention of water, 229-236.
—— Gospel differing from the Synoptists, 8.
—— Gospel, sacramental teaching of, 228-238.
—— mode of recording historical fact, 220-227.
—— proofs that Christ was God and Man, 272.
—— ὁ ἐπιστήθιος, 199.
—— view of the Gospel History, 220-227.

S. John's view of Christ's teaching, 220-227.
—— visit to Ephesus, 201, 204.
S. Luke, the author of the Third Gospel, 117-124.
—— the "Evangelist of the Gentiles," 121.
—— medical phraseology of his Gospel, 125-133.
S. Mark, the author of the Second Gospel, 75-85.
—— his graphic style, 86-93.
S. Mary Magdalene, her feast day, 149.
S. Matthew, the author of the First Gospel, 31-39.
—— identical with Levi, 35.
—— meaning of his name, 34.
S. Paul's influence on S. Luke, 118.
S. Peter's influence on S. Mark, 81-85, 102.
S. Peter, the "Rockman," 63.
Salim, 193.
Sanctuary, the door of the, 23.
Science and Revelation, their connection, 14.
Selection of the Evangelists for their work, 16.
Self-revelation of Christ, the, 258-292.
Sermons on the Mount and Plain, the, 44.
Seven devils, the, 148.
Seventy, mission of the, related by S. Luke, 123.
Shammai and Hillel, 251.
Siloam, procession to the Pool of, 214.
Sinful woman, the, 144-155.
Sources of the Evangelist's information, the, 1-9.
Spirit of Jairus's daughter, the, 157, 158.
—— of Jesus, the, 160.
Sweat, the Bloody, 130.
Sychar, 193.
Sympathy of Christ, the, 179.
Synagogue, discourse on Eucharistic doctrine in the, 239-248.

Tabernacles, Feast of the, 214.
"Table-talk" of Johnson, the, 3.
—— of Luther, the, 3.
Tell Hûm, excavations at, 240, 243.
Temple, Illumination of the, 216, 217.
—— scenes in the, recorded by S. Luke, 168-170.
Testimony of tradition to S. John's character, 201-209.
"Thorn in the Flesh," the, 120.
Title of apostle, the, 94.
—— used in the Third Gospel, 95.
Tradition, value of oral, 2.
Trumpets, Feast of, 214.
Two cock-crowings recorded only by S. Mark, 91.
Two miracles recorded only by S. Mark, 101.

Unity of the Catholic Church, the, 66-72.
Unity, subjective and objective, 67.
Unseen world, revelations of the, 156-165.

Value of Oral Tradition, the, 2.
Venice as connected with S. Mark, 85.
Verbal inspiration, meaning of, 12.
Views on inspiration, various, 12, 13.
Virgin Mary, life and character of the Blessed, 137.

Washing of the Disciples' feet by Christ, the, 232, 233.
Water frequently mentioned in the Fourth Gospel, 229-236.
Westcott on the Fourth Gospel, 192.
Witness of S. John to the Grace of Absolution, 249-257.

Womanhood exalted by S. Luke, 134-143.
Woman that was a sinner, the, 144-155.
Women, devout, the, in the Third Gospel, 141.
—— weeping, the, on the "Via Crucis," 142.
Wordsworth on Baptism and the Eucharist, 245.
—— on S. John vi., 242.
World, revelations of the Unseen, 156-165.
YOUNG MAN IN GETHSEMANE, the, 83.

Printed by T. and A. CONSTABLE, Printers to Her Majesty
at the Edinburgh University Press

Luckock, H. M.

~~1963~~ L964

Special characteristics of the four Gospels.

1900	Dr.	1900			
Je 13	Richey	Je 22			
Jan 2	mason	Jan 25			
ot mark 7	Weeks	mark 1			
	Harold	JAN 19			

29581

226 P
L964